Retracing Our Steps:
How Bilingualism was Institutionalized in the Canadian Federal Bureaucracy

Helaina Gaspard
Doctoral Candidate
École d'études politiques, Université d'Ottawa

Introduction

There is a lack of understanding of Canadian language policy among its citizens, namely with respect to its values, justifications and underlying principles (Magnet 1998; Macmillan 1998). Normatively, language has immense symbolic value related to the representation of a founding nation and the continuation of a community. Empirically, the language question carries immense political weight. As the current Commissioner of Official Languages, Graham Fraser (2006) has noted, there are four million unilingual francophones in Quebec and we must ask "how do you make those four million unilingual Francophones feel that they want to live in Canada?" In addition to the implications for national unity, four million unilingual francophones in a single province in Canada carries major electoral weight, making language a salient political issue.

Even though language has been and will likely continue to be a central element of Canadian politics, there remains much to be studied about the effects of language policy on the country's federal institutions. It was not until 1969 that the Official Languages Act (OLA) was adopted recognizing the equality of English and French in federal institutions (not just parliament) and made them the country's official languages. The legislation was an attempt to combat Quebec nationalism and separatist rhetoric by equalizing the status of French and English in federal institutions, encouraging francophones (mainly Quebecois) to view themselves as part of the broader Canadian project and to protect minority language communities across the country.

The country's federal institutions were directly affected by the OLA and the federal bureaucracy was no exception. Two changes to the OLA in 1973 and 1988 were aimed specifically at the bureaucracy. In 1973, the OLA was amended and required that the bureaucracy take action to ensure the numerical representation of francophones in the federal public service. In 1988, the amendment gave public servants the right to work in the official language of their choice. In both cases, however, the amendments did not create or enforce any policies or laws – they were guidelines that the bureaucracy was meant to follow but no details for their implementation were provided. Despite the lack of guidelines and details related to implementation, bilingualism was gradually institutionalized in the federal bureaucracy.

The institutionalization of bilingualism is relevant because it means that bilingualism has become more than a policy introduced to manage the country's internal dynamics but has become an integral part of its institutions requiring operational accommodation. Uncovering how institutionalization occurred is necessary because bilingualism has affected the bureaucracy's operation. For instance, the repercussions of the OLA and its amendments have reverberated throughout the federal bureaucracy. This has affected the institution's organizational culture, namely by changing its conception of merit that affects hiring, promotions and horizontal movement within the bureaucracy.

The purpose of this paper is to establish a framework for a thesis project that will seek to uncover the forces and factors behind the institutionalization of bilingualism. The project's central research question will ask: How was bilingualism institutionalized in the federal bureaucracy? The puzzle is how bilingualism institutionalized despite assumed institutional resistance to change and a lack of guidelines to implement policy changes defined in the OLA. The OLA and its amendments in 1973 and 1988 contributed to the institutionalization of bilingualism, but because these amendments did not provide any tools or guidelines with which to implement requirements, it is hypothesized that other forces and factors within and outside of the bureaucracy were at play, e.g. political actors, the introduction of new institutions such as the Charter etc.

To track the effects of language policy changes on the bureaucracy, the institution's organizational culture will be analysed. Organizational culture was selected as the independent variable because language policy changes impacted—the values and beliefs of the bureaucracy as well as their representation through practices and symbols—that culture. By monitoring how language policy changes affected elements of the institution's organizational culture (namely the merit principle), this project will attempt to isolate the factors and forces behind the institutionalization.

In order to establish the framework for the thesis project, this paper will first discuss the project's context grounding the project in an understanding of Canada as a multinational and multilingual state. Second, the importance of the symbolic value of language and its use—namely through official bilingualism—to mediate national tensions will be addressed. Following the importance of language, the third section of the paper will address the bureaucracy and make the case that it is more than a tool to manage immediate social concerns but is a case of the institutionalization of bilingualism, worthy of study. Fourth, the paper will discuss the theoretical framework and research design for the project and will close by addressing the methods and tools for research.

Canada in Context: A Multinational and Multilingual State

Understanding Canada as a multination state lies at the very heart of the project. The premise of the OLA and its effects on the bureaucracy are contingent upon the recognition of the nationhood status of the Quebecois (French-speaking Canada, mainly based in Quebec). Without an understanding of why Canada would seek to recognize its founding nations within its internal structures, we cannot ask how the effects should be analysed.

Various authors recognize Canada's multinational character. Kymlicka recognizes Canada as a multination composed of English Speaking Canada, French Speaking Canada and Aboriginal Peoples (Kymlicka 1998). Cairns (1995), echoes this three nations view and calls for a rethinking of citizenship to account for the three nations within the country. From a Québec-centric perspective, Gagnon and Iacovino (2007) recognize multinationalism as an inherent Canadian socio-political characteristic that should structure federal institutions and citizenship discourse. McRoberts (2001), notes that the Québécois, Aboriginals and Acadians all have nationhood claims in Canada. Despite the recognition within the literature, there remains a total disjunction between the political realm and the academic one. Although Canada is identified by academics as having the composing elements of a multination state, it is not explicitly recognized or reflected in its operation. This is demonstrated through federal political discourse that only acknowledges the Canadian nation (McRoberts, 2001).

Although Canada is not officially recognized as a multination state, actions and assertions by its internal nations confirm the characteristic. For instance, the citizenship debates that occurred in Québec evidence the province's self-understanding as a nation (see Gagnon and Iacovino 2007; Lisée 2007; Oakes and Warren 2007; Oakes 2004; Québec 2001; Jenson 1997). Further, Québec uses the area of public policy symbolically to highlight their version of the national framework (Béland and Lecours 2008; Béland and Lecours 2006; see also McEwen 2005; McEwen and Moreno 2005). The self-government rights of Aboriginal Peoples recognize their nationhood status as do treaty negotiations undertaken on a nation-to-nation basis (see Papillon 2008). However, many Aboriginal scholars argue that self-government does not adequately recognize nationhood status (as they seek self-determination) and further perpetuates the colonial relationship between Aboriginal peoples and the federal government (Irlbacher-Fox 2009; Coulthard 2007; Alfred 1999).

In contrast to the unofficial recognition of the country's multinational character, the country's multilingual status is explicit with official bilingualism established through the OLA. The OLA recognizes the country's founding nations in federal institutions through the equality of status of the French and the English language. Minority official language communities are also recognized, with the right to obtain federal services in the official language of their choice. The Canadian state, from the perspective of this project, accomplished a dual task with the implementation of the Official Languages Act 1969 (OLA): it established the state's role as a guarantor of language, recognizing multilingualism and implicitly recognized the country's multinational character (by recognizing two internal nations through the symbolic value of language).

This project understands Canada to be composed of three nations, Aboriginal Peoples, the Quebecois nation and English-speaking Canada. The fact that Quebec is recognized as a nation is not meant to negate the presence of minority Francophone communities across Canada. Rather, it is meant to highlight that Quebec puts forth distinct nationhood claims, whereas minority Francophone communities across the country do not necessarily self-identify as nations or as a single nation. The recognition of minority Francophone communities across the country is embedded within the OLA (Fraser 2006) and marks Canada's status as a multilingual state. No matter where you are in the country, you have the choice of obtaining services from or interacting with the federal government in either of the country's official languages. Having established Canada's status as a multination and multilingual state, the use of the country's institutions and policies to accommodate its internal diversity and foster unity will be discussed.

Bilingualism and the Symbolic Value of Language

There is a struggle over different visions of the language regime in Canada. The federal model focuses on two language communities, allowing the individual to select the community into which they wish to integrate. When Ottawa assigned language rights to individuals, they were symmetrical in conception and focused on linguistic minorities throughout the country (including the English in Québec). In contrast, the Québec model was grounded in the territorial principle and was focused on the flourishing of a particular collective group (McRoberts 2004; see also Cardinal 2006). Federal and Québec language policies were fundamentally at odds because Ottawa's policy was focused on institutional bilingualism whereas Québec's language policies focused on the territorial principle (McRoberts 2004).

The failures of federal language policies are well documented in the literature, particularly because of the national unity implications that language debates have in the country (McRoberts 2004; Cardinal 2006). For instance, McRoberts (1997) argues that Trudeau's national unity strategy that incorporated official bilingualism through the principle of individuality failed to foster unity and even contributed to the country's disunity because it required Francophone Canadians (namely Quebecois) to identify with a nation-building project that was unrepresentative of their ideas. Federal language policies are also perceived to have failed minority language communities—the very communities the legislation was meant to protect (Cardinal 2004; Gilbert 2001; McRae 1978; Pal 1995). Despite the general malaise in the literature when it comes to the success of current policies and practices related to language in the country, language remains a key component to national unity (Savoie 1991) and requires analytical attention.

The symbolic value of bilingualism policies in Canada and their implications for national unity are well addressed in the literature (see for example, Taylor 1993; Savoie 1991; Magnet 1998; McRoberts 2004; Cardinal 2004; etc.) but there lacks a clear explanation of the principles

underlying these language policies (Magnet 1998; Macmillan 1998). From this lacuna, an emphasis on the normative aspects of language has emerged in the literature on bilingualism (Patten 2009). The normative element of the study of language focuses on language as more than a means for communication. It has symbolic value by transmitting and propagating symbols, collective memory and provokes sentiments of shared identity and belonging (Lapierre 1988; Williams 1991; Coulombe 2000). As language constitutes the main marker of communal identity, language policy has symbolic properties which can be conceptualized as the political fulfillment of moral and historical claims made by a community (Coulombe 2000; Williams 1991; Macmillan 1998; Magnet 1998; Lapierre 1988).

The symbolic value of language and its use is a function of individual choice, but more importantly, it is also the result of social practices and institutions that profoundly influence incentives and opportunities. Some of the most influential institutions are state regulated—these institutions are not maintained by individual choices in civil society, but by public policy (Patten 2009). And in a globalized world dominated by the English language, the state will come to play an increasingly important role in the promulgation and management of Canada's official languages (Laponce 2006).

The state's role in formulating and implementing language policy in Canada has contributed to the institutionalization of bilingualism in the country's federal institutions. Although the reasoning behind the policies are not always clearly explained and justified to citizens, the repercussions of the OLA and its amendments have reverberated throughout the federal bureaucracy. This has affected conceptions of merit, promotions and hiring practices, but how these amendments and policies emerged is not well defined in the literature. A large portion of Canadian literature on bilingualism chronicles the changes and adaptations of language policies to the socio-political climate of the current era (Joy 1972; Wilson and Mullins 1978; Cardinal 2004; Canada 2009), but does not explain the factors behind the emergence of the policies, unlike the well documented trajectory and factors behind the implementation of language laws in Quebec (see Corbeil 2007; Bourhis 1984; Oakes and Warren 2007 etc.).

In order to better understand how language policy changes—primarily through the OLA (1969) and its amendments in 1973 related to representation and 1988 related to performance— impacted the federal bureaucracy, this project will seek to develop a chronology of the causes and factors behind the language policy transition from representation to performance. What combination of forces fuelled these changes? Were the resulting policy changes thinner variants of original proposals? These questions remain unanswered in the literature. This project, through archival research will seek to answer them. It is necessary that the forces behind the transition be determined in order to better understand how bilingualism impacted the bureaucracy's organizational culture and was ultimately institutionalized.

The Bureaucracy: More Than a Tool, a Case of Institutionalization

How bilingualism institutionalized federally is more than the result of a policy shift, but evidences broader institutional change. Although Canada's political institutions were modelled after those of Britain in the Westminster tradition, the evolution of these institutions, the bureaucracy included, reflect the salience of issues inherent to the Canadian polity, notably the politics of language. The marked differences between the operation of the Canadian and British systems of government are thus a result of internal political dynamics (Smith 2002). The federal bureaucracy is no exception. The federal bureaucracy has been used since the 1960s as a tool to manage Canada's linguistic diversity by encouraging Francophone representation within the body

(Wilson and Mullins 1978; Gagnon, Turgeon and DeChamplain 2007), in an attempt to create a representative bureaucracy.

The concept of representative bureaucracy originated in Donald J. Kingsley's seminal work, *Representative Bureaucracy*. According to Kingsley, a representative bureaucracy, one that reflected the society it served, would be better suited to know the needs of its citizens and would enjoy increased levels of confidence and validity from them. Little work has been done on the importance or relevance of representative bureaucracies in multination states. The literature on the bureaucracy, even within multination states tends to focus on costs and benefits of measures used to achieve the adequate representation of linguistic groups (i.e. in Canada) or the normative arguments that underlie these measures (Gagnon, Turgeon and de Champlain 2006; see also Beattie and Spencer 1971; Carson 1972; Wilson and Mullins 1978; Gentil, O'Connor and Bigras 2008). Gagnon, Turgeon and de Champlain (2006) seek to correct this gap in the literature by engaging in a comparative perspective to evaluate the various mechanisms used in multination states to achieve a representative bureaucracy. Their main argument is that a multination state's understanding of its national diversity and its territorial organization affect the mechanisms it employs for representation within its bureaucracy (Gagnon, Turgeon and de Champlain 2006).

Although in its initial phases, the literature on representative bureaucracy in multination states can be useful in the Canadian context when addressing questions of language in the bureaucracy. The representation of official language minorities in a country like Canada can have important implications for the stability and democracy of a country. Two reasons for their representation include: first, a means to quell internal conflict by ensuring minority groups view themselves as contributors to the polity; and second, it can also demonstrate attempts to reflect societal diversity (Gagnon, Turgeon and DeChamplain 2007; Groeneveld and Van de Walle 2010).

Although a representative bureaucracy can be a mechanism to foster stability and reflect social diversity within states, Groeneveld and Van de Walle (2010) conclude that modern diversity management approaches alone may not contribute to nation-building because they mainly emphasize organizational performance. They argue that policy debates on representative bureaucracy mingle three different dimensions: power, equal opportunities and diversity. These dimensions not only reflect a particular view on the role of the state and the relation between the state and citizens, they also diverge in the motives for making the bureaucracy representative.

The Canadian case supports this perspective. Wilson and Mullins (1978), also concluded that diversity management measures were not enough. The authors maintain that the sociological heterogeneity of the federal public service is a benefit but that the use of legislated quotas is inefficacious to address representation. With respect to francophone representation specifically, legislated quotas are considered superficial and anachronistic (Wilson and Mullins 1978). Based on the language policy changes in 1973 and 1988 and Wilson and Mullin's assessment, there is more to the issue of language in the federal public service than solely a question of representation. Granted, during the 1960s-1970s when national tensions were high, the bureaucracy was used as a tool to foster unity within the country. However, the use of the bureaucracy as a tool to respond to the social tensions of the era does not explain the institutionalization of bilingualism.

Operational accommodation of the OLA within the bureaucracy was required to meet the representation and performance criteria established in the policy's amendments. What is interesting is that the legislation did not indicate how to achieve the criteria but the organizational culture of the bureaucracy gradually changed to accommodate them. For instance, the merit

principle was modified to include language, but this was not a legislated requirement—the bureaucracy acted to gradually institutionalize bilingualism but the forces behind this remain unclear. This indicates that the bureaucracy is more than a symbolic space in which the country's linguistic tensions can be mediated. Rather, the bureaucracy is an example of how bilingualism has affected the operation of federal institutions (See Smith 2002).

Most research on language in the bureaucracy does not address the causes of changes in policies affecting the bureaucracy but rather assesses the current state of the bureaucracy. Scientific research on bilingualism in the bureaucracy has tended to be quantitative, focusing on the bureaucracy's numeric composition. Such studies seek to quantify the number of Anglophones and Francophones in the public service and the retention of French-language training among Anglophones (Blackburn 1969; Carson 1972; Edwards 1976; Borins 1984; Gentil, O'Connor and Bigras 2008). What is missing in the literature is an assessment of how and why bilingualism has been woven into the fabric of the federal bureaucracy through legislation pertaining to representation and performance. Understanding what caused these changes is necessary to explain the institutionalization of bilingualism in the federal bureaucracy.

The institutionalization of bilingualism is understood here to be more than the representation of official languages in key strategic areas of the country like its public administration (Williams 2008). Bilingualism is institutionalized in the federal bureaucracy because bilingualism, as defined in the OLA has been accommodated in the regular operation of the bureaucracy and has become more than a policy but part of the institution's fabric. The bureaucracy has had to modify its practices (related for instance to representation, language of work etc.) over time, such that today, bilingualism in the bureaucracy exists as social knowledge and is part of the body's reality (see Zucker 1977).[*]

Current approaches to the study of the bureaucracy or its use to manage a country's diversity respond to immediate political or social concerns. The studies of the bureaucracy as a representative institution or as an institution to manage internal diversity do not enable us to understand the reasons behind language policy shifts that led to the institutionalization of bilingualism and affected the bureaucracy. For this reason, the bureaucracy will be studied as a case of institutionalization in this project—recognizing it as more than a tool to manage diversity or a symbolic space to foster national unity.

Theoretical Framework

This project seeks to understand the processes and changes to the OLA that led to the institutionalization of bilingualism in the Canadian federal bureaucracy. In order to undertake this task, the project will engage in contextual analysis to construct a chronology of the OLA and will also engage in institutional focused analysis to understand how the policy and its changes led to the institutionalization of bilingualism in the federal bureaucracy.

The theoretical framework constructed for this project has three components: historical institutionalism (HI), layering and social learning. HI will serve as the broad frame for the project as the study will focus on the longitudinal development and amendments to the OLA. The purpose of the chronology is to develop a skeleton of the OLA that can be fleshed out by

---

[*] Officially, the bureaucracy adheres to the principles of representation and performance as defined in the OLA. In practice, this may not be the case as both languages may not be used interchangeably across all departments or in all positions. How bilingualism currently operates within the public service is not the focus of this project. Rather, this project is interested in explaining how bilingualism was institutionalized in an effort to better understand practices today.

uncovering the factors responsible for the trajectory of the OLA and its amendments. The theory's emphasis on path dependency promotes an understanding of the persistence and continuity of institutions, to favour and reproduce power arrangements that perpetuate their existence, but is ineffective at explaining change.

Change within HI can only be explained by critical junctures, which are major historical moments where there is a rise in tensions and a struggle for power, allowing for major institutional change. Such moments are brought upon by exogenous shock or factors outside of the institutions themselves (Hall and Taylor 1996). Without critical junctures, HI cannot explain change. This is particularly problematic when change is gradual, as it was in the case of the OLA. To correct for this deficiency, this project will engage with the concept of *layering* as proposed by Mahoney and Thelen (2010).

Layering is useful for this project because it allows for the theorization of gradual change. Layering occurs when new rules are attached to existing ones, changing the ways in which original rules structure behaviour. Wholly new institutions or rules are not introduced, but layering instead involves amendments, revisions or additions to existing ones. Each change may be small, but small changes can accumulate making big change over the long run (Mahoney and Thelen 2010).

This model of gradual institutional change fits very well with the trajectory of the OLA. The OLA was adopted in 1969 and since then, it has been amended and revised without abolishing the existing institution or introducing a wholly new institution. Although change brought upon by amendments to the OLA related to the bureaucracy were gradual, the result was significant as bilingualism is seemingly institutionalized in the body. Layering is a useful and complimentary concept for HI because it enables the use of the longitudinal and path dependent elements of HI while correcting for the theory's inability to explain gradual change.

The final component of the theoretical framework is the social learning component, as proposed by Peter Hall (1993). Social learning focuses on the interaction between institutions and ideas. As Hall explains, ideas and institutions reinforce each other and can both influence the policy process. The social learning component of the framework is necessary to uncover the factors behind the changes to the OLA because it accounts for factors like ideas and actors beyond the realm of formally analysed institutions. Social learning is particularly useful for connecting institutions and ideas as partners fostering policy change.

Hall's work suggests that the policymaking process can be structured by a set of ideas just as it can be structured by a set of institutions. The two often reinforce each other because policymaking routines usually reflect a particular set of ideas about what can and should be done in a policy sphere. This requires a state-structural perspective, where the influence of state institutions are recognized but the role of ideas that come from various actors are not discounted. From this perspective, there is a much broader base of influences affecting a policy shift other than government and its elite officials (Hall 1993).

Research Design

The organizational culture of the bureaucracy changed between t_1 and t_2 with the implementation of the OLA (1969) to the present day. Precisely how these changes occurred and what factors were responsible will be the focus of the project. The dependent variable for the project will be the organizational culture of the bureaucracy as operationalized through the merit principle. The Public Service Commission (PSC) does not provide a definition of organizational culture, although the term is used in various reports (see for instance *Guide to the Sub-delegation of Appointment and Appointment-related Authorities* (Amended October 2008)*; Report of*

Internal Audit Committee to the Commissioners of the Public Service Commissioners of the Public Service Commission for the Calendar Year 2009 (February 2010); *Qualitative Research on Bureaucratic Patronage* (October 2005)). With no official definition, organizational culture will be defined here as the values and beliefs shared by members of an organization, as well as the observable symbols and representations associated with those values and beliefs (DeForest Molina 2009).

Organizational change will be used to track the institutionalization of bilingualism. In order to measure change in organizational culture, changes to the merit principle will be assessed. During the 1960s-1970s, the PSC determined that the merit principle failed to create a representative public service. This was because francophones, women and Aboriginals were absent from higher ranks (or all ranks in the case of Aboriginal peoples) of the bureaucracy. In response, the PSC adopted a more dynamic conception of merit instead of one narrow in application (Juillet and Rasmussen, 2008). Language requirements for instance, were added to the merit principle. Tracking the changes to the merit principal reflect changes to the bureaucracy's organizational culture because merit defines the institution's values and beliefs that underlie promotions, hiring and horizontal movement within the bureaucracy.

This project is looking specifically at how bilingualism was institutionalized within the political structure of the bureaucracy. It must be clear that this project is not seeking to quantify the operationalization of bilingualism within the bureaucracy, e.g. the number of civil servants mostly working in French or English, whether positions designated as bilingual truly operate as such etc. Questions related to the empirics of bilingualism in the federal bureaucracy have the potential to be addressed in future research, but that is not the focus here.

The independent variables used to explain change will be institutions and administrative forces (namely political actors). The identification of specific institutions, be they old or new and the currency of the ideas and actions of actors are crucial to understand how and why institutionalization occurred as it did. The power of existing and newly created institutions on the OLA and its amendments will be assessed through the institutional variable. Following a HI approach, institutions are defined from a material perspective clearly dividing institutions and society. Examples include formal or informal procedures, routines, norms and conventions embedded in the organizational structure of the polity or political economy, such as constitutional order, operating procedure of a bureaucracy etc. Institutions are considered to privilege certain interests while demobilizing others (Hall and Taylor 1996).

The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982) (hereinafter the Charter), serves as an excellent example of the influencing power of institutions on the OLA. Once the Charter was adopted, legislation had to correspond to the newly constitutionally entrenched individual rights. In particular, the 1988 amendment to the OLA was likely a direct result of the need to 'Charter-proof' the OLA. By enabling bureaucrats to work in the official language of their choice, the 1988 amendment to the OLA responded to the official language rights of individuals (see Cardinal 2004). Although the Charter may not be the sole variable that influenced the adoption of the 1988 amendment, it was likely a contributing factor.

The second independent variable, administrative forces, will be understood to encompass the role of political actors (namely political and bureaucratic elites) that were instrumental in the formulation and implementation of policy. This variable is important because it recognizes, as does Hall (1993) through the concept of social learning, the influence that ideas can have on existing institutions. For instance, former Prime Minister Brian Mulroney could be considered an administrative force with respect to the 1988 amendment to the OLA. Although the Charter was likely the primary influencer on the amendment, Mulroney, as an actor committed to bringing

Quebec into the Canadian constitution with 'honour and enthusiasm,' would have had the ability to influence the timing and wording of the language policy.

Institutions and administrative forces as independent variables provide important insights into the evolution and institutionalization of the OLA in the political culture of the bureaucracy. By using these variables, this project can account for both the influence of material institutions while still ensuring that the power of ideas and individual actors are accounted for.

Methodology

In order to achieve both an understanding of the historical trajectory of the OLA, its effects on the bureaucracy's organizational culture and ultimately to understand the institutionalization of bilingualism in the bureaucracy, archived sources, interviews and policy analysis will be used.

Archives

Library and Archives Canada (LAC) will be the source for cabinet and government documents. Such documents will serve to construct an understanding of the factors behind the emergence of the OLA and its amendments. A timeline, based on archival sources will be constructed and the sources will be tested against each other for consistency and accuracy. Cabinet briefing notes and cabinet conclusions will help to better understand the proposals that were considered and which factors influenced decision making on official bilingualism. LAC has access to cabinet documents up to 1976. For all cabinet documents after that time, an access to information and privacy (ATIP) request will be submitted to the Privy Council Office for review to potentially release the documents.

Along with the resources at LAC, personal archives of past public servants such as Gérard Pelletier (an instrumental figure in the passage of the OLA), will also be accessed. These personal archives may help uncover the informal mechanisms and actions of various players not typically recorded in official government documents but that may have affected the OLA and the institutionalization of bilingualism. Further, the *Centre de recherche en civilisation canadienne-française* at the University of Ottawa, will be a useful resource to access the archives of various individuals and organizations engaged in the political and social elements related to language rights.

Government reports will also be a key component of research. LAC's Index to Federal Royal Commissions will be used to access and study relevant Royal Commissions, namely those on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission) as well as that on Government Organization (the Glassco Commission). These commissions will help to establish the evolution of perceptions and policies related to language and bureaucracy and the tools used to achieve different goals.

Annual reports from the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages (OCOL) will help track politically defined problems and their proposed responses. The Department of Justice's online archives will also be used to obtain copies of legislation pertaining to bilingualism, notably the OLA and its amendments in 1973 and 1988. The timing and wording of the legislation will be of interest to the project, particularly because it marks the evolution of the language policy in the country.

Semi-Structured Interviews

The semi-structured interview format was selected because it enables the researcher to develop initial guiding questions but allows the interview to take on a more natural flow, with the

researcher developing and adjusting questions as required. The format will also enable past and present bureaucrats and other experts to draw on their vast knowledge and experiences when answering a question. The interviews are being done to foster a better understanding of historical context leading up to and during the amendments to the OLA and the factors behind the changes. What are sought are broad ideas or indicators about what happened and why, the focus is not entirely on the way the interviewees explain or describe their experiences. The interview questions are meant to uncover ideas and indicators but also to get at informal mechanisms and behaviour within the bureaucracy.

The insider perspectives provided by past and present civil servants such as Max Yalden, Graham Fraser, Edgar Gallant and Gérard Veilleux, will be instrumental. It is expected that the majority of interviews will be undertaken with people who were civil servants from the late 1970s to the present. Initial selection of participants will be done based on their past or current positions in the public service and their connection to the implementation, change or upholding of the current policy. From these initial contacts, the intention is to use the 'snowball' method to gather other potential participants based on interviewees' networks and suggestions.

Public Policy Analysis

The OLA and its subsequent amendments in 1973 and 1988 serve as the case studies of the project to uncover how the institutionalization of bilingualism occurred in the federal bureaucracy. The legal text of the OLA from the Department of Justice will be reviewed to understand the policy changes and instruments adopted with each amendment. The OCOL publishes various reports related to the current status of language use, suggestions for improvement and critiques for the current federal system and minority official language communities across the country. These reports will also be reviewed as they provide detailed information about past processes and practices while also serving to diffuse up to date statistics and content.

Of particular interest to this project will be the policy *process* (various determinants of a policy, the actors and institutions that shaped it), policy *content* (problem definition, goals, instruments), and the *outcomes* of policy (legislation, regulations, actual impact or effect) (Pal 2001). The intention of the project is not to understand what people thought or how they perceived the OLA (interpretivist) but rather what happened to the OLA and how its amendments resulted in the institutionalization of bilingualism, which requires positivist interpretation of facts and procedures that resulted in the policy changes.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to explain the framework for a thesis project seeking to uncover how bilingualism was institutionalized in the federal bureaucracy. By establishing the context of the project – Canada as a multinational and multilingual state – this paper intended to demonstrate the political salience and practical relevance of the influence of bilingualism on the country's federal bureaucracy. The symbolic value of language and the bureaucracy as a case of institutionalization make Canada a unique case for analysis. Although the country established official bilingualism federally in the OLA, no criteria or guidelines to implement the policy in the bureaucracy were provided in the policy. Despite the lack of legislation, bilingualism gradually institutionalized in the federal bureaucracy, namely through its organizational culture. Precisely how did this institutionalization occur? What were the forces and factors behind it? It is these questions that the larger thesis project seeks to answer.

The thesis project opens various potential avenues for future research within Canadian politics and from a comparative perspective. Within the Canadian field, an understanding of how bilingualism was institutionalized can contribute to studies related to the functionality of the policy within the bureaucracy and the resulting hiring/promoting practices. Other areas of potential study include comparisons with other multilingual and/or multinational states. Potential research questions that can be asked include: Does Canada have a unique way of institutionalizing language? How does the Canadian process compare with that of other countries? Has the institutionalization of bilingualism occurred elsewhere? If so, how?

There remains much to be studied about language and its impacts on the Canadian state. Although it has been a central political question since the country's founding with repercussions for citizens, there is a lack of understanding of the values, justifications and underlying principles related to language policy (Magnet 1998; Macmillan 1998). In order to understand how we go to where we are today and how language has affected our federal institutions, we must retrace our steps.

References

Alfred, Taiaiake. (1999). *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Beattie, C. and B.G. Spencer. (1971). "Career Attainment in Canadian Bureaucracies: Unscrambling the Effects of Age, Seniority, Education, and Ethnolinguistic Factors on Salary." *The American Journal of Sociology* 77 (3), 472-490.

Béland, Daniel and Lecours, André. (2006). "Sub-state nationalism and the welfare state: Québec and Canadian federalism." *Nations and Nationalism* 12 (1), 77-96.

Béland, Daniel and André Lecours. (2008). *Nationalism and Social Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Blackburn, G.A. (1969). "A Bilingual and Bicultural Public Service." *Canadian Public Administration* 12, 36-44.

Borins, Sandford F. (1984). "Language use in the federal public service: some recent survey results." *Canadian Public Administration* 27, 262-268.

Cairns, Alan. The Fragmentation of Canadian Citizenship. In C. Williams (Ed.), *Reconfigurations: Canadian Citizenship and Constitutional Change*. McLelland and Stewart, 1995.

Canada. Library of Parliament. (2009). *Official Languages in the Public Service: From 1973 to the Present*. Ottawa.

Cardinal, Linda. (2006). Les enjeux de la diversité linguistique au Canada et au Québec. In J. Palard, A.G. Gagnon and B. Gagnon (Eds.), *Diversité et identitiés au Québec et dans les régions d'Europe*. Québec: Les presses de l'Université Laval.

Cardinal, Linda. (2004). "The Limits of Bilingualism in Canada." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 10, 79-103.

Carey, Stephen. (1997). "Language Management, Official Bilingualism, and Multiculturalism in Canada." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 17, 204-223.

Carson, J.J. (1972). "Bilingualism in the Public Service." *Canadian Public Administration* 15 (2), 190-193.

Corbeil, Jean-Claude. (2007). *L'embarras des langues : origine, conception et évolution de la politique linguistique québécoise*. Montréal : Québec Amérique.

Coulombe, Pierre A. (2000). Citizenship and Official Bilingualism. In Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman (Eds.), *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Coulthard, Glen. (2007). "Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the 'Politics of Recognition' in Canada." *Contemporary Political Theory* 6 (4), 437-461.

Edwards, G. (1976). "Second-Language Retention in the Canadian Public Service." *Canadian Modern Language Review* 32, 305-308.

Fraser, Graham. (2006). *Sorry I Don't Speak French: Confronting the Canadian Crisis that Won't Go Away*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

Fraser, Graham. Interview by author. June 29, 2009.

Gagnon, Alain-G. and Raffaele Iacovino. (2007). *Federalism, Citizenship and Quebec: Debating Multinationalism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gagnon, Alain-G., Luc Turgeon et Olivier de Champlain. (2006). "La bureaucratie représentative au sein des états multinationaux." *Revue française d'administration publique* 118, 291-306.

Gentil, Guillaume, Maureen O'Connor and Josée Bigras. (2008). "Le maintien du français chez les fonctionnaires fédéraux anglophones: Impact d'un programme de formation linguistique." *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 65, 841-867.

Gilbert, Anne. "Le français au Canada, entre droits et géographie." (2001). *Le géographe canadien* 45, 173-179.

Groeneveld, Sandra and Steven Van de Walle. (2010). "A contingency approach to representative bureaucracy: power, equal opportunities and diversity." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 76, 239-258.

Hall, Peter. (1993). "Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain." *Comparative Politics* 25 (3), 275-296.

Hall, Peter A. And Rosemary C. R. Taylor. (1996). Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms. *Political Studies* 44, 936-957.

Irlbacher-Fox, Stephanie. (2009). *Finding Dahshaa*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Jenson, Jane. (1997). "Fated to Live in Interesting Times: Canada's Changing Citizenship Regimes." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 30 (4), 627-644.

Joy, Richard J. (1972). *Languages in Conflict*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.

Kingsley, J. Donald. (2003). Representative bureaucracy. In Julie Dolan and David H. Rosenbloom (Eds.), *Representative Bureaucracy: Classic Readings and Continuing Controversies*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Krislov, Samuel. (2003). Representative Bureaucracy. In Julie Dolan and David H. Rosenbloom (Eds.), *Representative Bureaucracy: Classic Readings and Continuing Controversies*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Kymlicka, Will. (1998). *Finding Our Way: Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Laponce, Jean. (2006). *Loi de Babel et autres régularités et rapports entre langue et politique*. Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Lapierre, Jean-William. (1988). *Le pouvoir politique et les langues*. Presses Universitaires de France.

Lindblom, Charles E. (1979). "Still Muddling, Not Yet Through." *Public Administration Review* 39 (6), 517-526.

Lisée, Jean-François. (2007). *Nous*. Montréal: Boréal.

Macmillan, Michael C. (1998). *The Practice of Language Rights in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mahoney, James and Kathleen Thelen. (2010). A Theory of Gradual Institutional Change. In James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen (Eds.), *Explaining Institutional Change*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Magnet, Joseph Eliot. (1998). Language Rights Theory in Canadian Perspective. In Thomas Ricento and Barabra Burnaby (Eds.), *Language and Politics in the United States and Canada: Myths and Realities*. Mahwah, N.J. : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

McEwen, Nicola. (2005). "The Territorial Politics of Social Policy Development in Multi-level States." *Regional and Federal Studies* 15 (4), 537-544.

McEwen, Nicola and Luis Moreno. (2005). Exploring the territorial politics of welfare. In Nicola McEwen and Luis Moreno (Eds.), *The Territorial Politics of Welfare*. New York: Routledge.

McRae, Kenneth D. (1978). "Bilingual Language Districts in Finland and Canada: Adventures in the Transplanting of an Institution." *Canadian Public Policy* 4 (3), 331-351.

McRoberts, Kenneth. (2004). Struggling Against Territory: Language Policy in Canada. In Tony Judt and Denis Lacorne (Eds.), *Language, Nation and State: Identity Politics in a Multilingual Age*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

McRoberts, Kenneth. (2001). "Canada and the Multination State." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 34 (4), 683-713.

McRoberts, Kenneth. (1997). *Misconceiving Canada: The Struggle for National Unity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Meier, K.J. and D.P. Hawes. (2006). "Le lien entre représentivité passive et active de l'administration." *Revue française d'administration publique* 118, 265-279.

Molina, Anthony DeForest. (2009). "Values in Public Administration: The Role of Organisational Culture." *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior* 12(2), 266-279.

Mosher, Frederick C. (1982). *Democracy and the Public Service*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Oakes, Leigh. "French: a language for everyone in Quebec?" *Nations and Nationalism* 10 (4), 539-558.

Oakes, Leigh and Warren, Jane. (2007). *Language, Citizenship and Identity in Quebec*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Pal, Leslie A. (2001). *Beyond Policy Analysis (Second Edition)*. Toronto: Nelson Thomson Learning.

Pal, Leslie A. (1995). "Language, Policy, and Rights in Canada: Pragmatism v. Politics." *International Issues* 38, 38-55.

Papillon, Martin. (2008). Canadian Federalism and the Emerging Mosaic of Aboriginal Multilevel Governance. In Herman Bakvis and Grace Skogstad (Eds.), *Canadian Federalism. Performance, Effectiveness, and Legitimacy, 2nd Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Patten, Alan. (2009). Survey Article: The Justification of Minority Language Rights. *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 17, p. 102-128.

Peters, B. Guy. (2005). *Institutional Theory in Political Science*. New York: Continuum.

Québec. (2001) Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec. *Le français, une langue pour tout le monde*. Commission des États généraux sur l'avenir de la langue française au Québec. Quebec : Quebec.

Rosenbloom, David H. and Julie Dolan. (2006). "La bureaucratie représentative." *Revue française d'administration publique* 118, 251-264.

Savoie, Donald J. (1991). "The Politics of Language." *Reflections/Réflexions 9*. Kingston: Institute for Intergovernmental Relations.

Schmidt, Vivien A. (2008). Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse. *Annual Review of Political Science* 11, 303-326.

Seidman, Irving. (1998). *Interviewing as Qualitative Research, Second Edition*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Selden, S.C., J.L. Brudney and J.E. Kellough. (1998). "Bureaucracy as a Representative Institution: Toward a Reconciliation of Bureaucratic Government and Democratic Theory." *American Journal of Political Science*, 717-744.

Smith, David E. (2002). "The Westminster-Model in Ottawa." *British Journal of Canadian Studies* 15, 54-64.

Taylor, Charles. (1993). "Shared and Divergent Values." *Reconciling the Solitudes: Essays on Canadian Federalism and Nationalism*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Tully, James. (2001). Introduction. In Alain-G. Gagnon and James Tully (Eds.), *Multinational Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Wilson, Seymour and Willard Mullins. (1978). "Representative bureaucracy: linguistic/ethnic aspects in Canadian public policy." *Canadian Public Administration* 21, 513-538.

Williams, Colin H. (2008). *Linguistic Minorities in Democratic Context*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Williams, Colin H. (Ed.) (1991). *Linguistic Minorities Society and Territory*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Zucker, Lynne G. (1977). The Role of Institutionalization in Cultural Persistence. *American Sociological Review* 42, 726-743.