

Gail Johnson

Life at McGill for the Native French-Speaking Quebecer

An overall perspective

The increasing number of francophone students attending McGill is a factor of unknown potential for the "idea" of this university, for it is generally recognised that the differences between anglophone and francophone are not merely linguistic. In 1978 Gail Johnson conducted a survey of students of both groups at McGill, on behalf of the University Planning Office, and presents here a selection of significant conclusions that may be drawn from it. The French-speaking students, while feeling no threat to their sense of ethnicity in this one-time "fortress of anglophone supremacy," were nevertheless far quicker to respond to the questionnaire, which we present in full. What is often interesting in this study, as is sometimes the case with research, is the absence of difference between the groups, in areas where one might have expected some. There is also an absence of evidence that contact between the groups is making for any greater interaction between them.

Possibly the most central issue in Quebec society today is the apparent change in the nature and degree of intergroup relations between English- and French-Canadians in the direction of a polarization of the two societies. The issue reflects a more fundamental one, not restricted to Quebec, which concerns man's attempts to grapple, both intellectually and behaviourally, with the cultural differences he perceives between his own group and others.

In a review of the literature of racial and ethnic group relations, Yehuda Amir (1969) teased out a common assumption that the types of contact between groups can change mutual beliefs and attitudes. He emphasizes that this assumption is often interpreted to mean change in a positive direction. Furthermore, "such a view would maintain that men are basically good and seek understanding and mutual appreciation. If only one had the opportunity to communicate

with others and to appreciate their way of life, understanding and consequently a reduction of prejudice would follow." However, Amir concludes that although "changes in ethnic relations do occur following intergroup contact . . . the nature of this change is not necessarily in the anticipated direction. 'Favorable' conditions do tend to reduce prejudice, but 'unfavorable' conditions may increase intergroup tension and prejudice" (pp. 319-320; see also Isaacs, 1958, p. 403).

Included in studies of ethnic relations is an area focusing on contacts between ethnolinguistic groups, those differing with respect to language as well as ethnicity. The unique aspect of these studies concerns man's ability to acquire a second language, or even several, the better to communicate with and understand the people who speak that language. As Gardner and Lambert (1972) have concluded, "learning a second-language seems to depend on the learner's attitudes towards the people who use that language." This makes the degree of bilingualism in a society, related as it seems to be to individuals' attitudes about others, a fluid and dynamic social process.

An extensive research literature on this aspect of bilingualism has developed from investigations performed in the province of Quebec, where French-speaking populations co-reside. Robert C. Gardner and Donald M. Taylor, along with their associates, have conducted numerous studies of ethnic stereotypes, several of which were carried out in Quebec and were based upon the study of these two ethnolinguistic groups (see for example Gardner, Wonnacott, and Taylor, 1968; Gardner and Taylor, 1968; Taylor and Gardner, 1970; Clément, Gardner, and Smythe, 1977).

A native French-speaker, in choosing to attend McGill University, becomes part of a largely English-Canadian social milieu. His reasons for making this choice and the consequences of his experiences at McGill are a focal point of this study.

McGill's twelve faculties serve varying proportions of francophone and anglophone students. The overall full-time undergraduate enrollment of francophones is 17.8%. In addition, there are two McGill campuses, which differ widely with respect to community setting, proportions of native English-speakers or French-speakers, and campus size. The main campus is situated in downtown Montreal, and the smaller, Macdonald College branch, is located about 20 miles away in the more rural community setting of St. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec. This latter campus, exclusively devoted to housing the Faculty of Agriculture, has the largest francophone student enrolment of all the faculties (about 36%).

The present report has two distinct goals: 1) to describe the native French-speaking student's experience at an English-language institution by comparing his or her questionnaire responses to a corresponding group of native English-speaking students at the same institution, and 2) to explore whether contact between these two ethnolinguistic groups in the university milieu leads to their

social interaction, both within and outside the school setting. This question stems from a study by Taylor, Meynard, and Rheault (1977; see also Taylor, 1977) who proposed a relation between second-language learning and threat to one's ethnic identity. They found that the greater the contact with English-speakers, the less do French-Canadians perceive that learning to speak English will have negative consequences for self-identity.

The method of the study

Subjects

The subjects in this report were 400 McGill University undergraduates of mean age 20.9. They were divided into two groups of 242 and 158 native speakers of French and English, respectively, who completed a questionnaire and returned it by mail. The samples were also divided with respect to sex and to year of study (that is, either year 1 or year 3).

The total number of questionnaires mailed was 598: 273 and 325 were sent to English-speaking and French-speaking students, respectively (the French sample was made larger since sparse returns from this group would have had a more significant bearing on the study). These potential respondents were chosen from a population of 3149 McGill students who met the following criteria. French sample: registered as a full-time undergraduate student; permanent address designated as within Quebec province; native language (that is, mother tongue) is French; graduated from a French CEGEP* (that is, equivalent to completion of grade 13); currently enrolled in U1 or U3 (that is, first and final years of university, respectively); Canadian citizen or landed immigrant. Requirements for the English sample were the same as those for the French except, of course, that the word "English" is substituted for the word "French." This population was then divided into eight subgroups, according to the 2X2X2 combinations of native language, year of study, and sex. Finally, an approximately equal number of potential respondents were selected by the proportionate intervals from each subgroup.

Apparatus

An English or a French translation of the questionnaire was sent to the subject, according to his (or her) designated mother tongue (see Appendix). The two versions of the questionnaire were nearly identical in content, except for a) an additional question in the French one and b) a few items which could only be meaningfully phrased in comparable, rather than equivalent, terms.

The questionnaire was designed to measure various personal qualities of the subject, such as ability in English, degree of social contact with own versus other

*CEGEP is the acronym for Collège d'enseignement général et professionnel, the post-secondary institution that is prerequisite for university and various careers in Quebec.

ethnolinguistic group, and several others. A cover letter, introducing the survey and stating its purpose, accompanied the questionnaire (see Appendix) along with a stamped return envelope.

Procedure

Questionnaires were sent to the sessional addresses of students. When completed, the questionnaire was mailed in the return envelope, which was self-addressed to the McGill University Planning Office, sponsor of the study.

No attempt was made to follow up the group of non-respondents.

The analysis of data is based upon comparisons of mean pairs and of percentage pairs as well as upon the tests of significance, chi square, and analysis of variance. Any significant response differences due to the campus attended, sex, or year of study are also analyzed for most questionnaire items.

A discussion of results

The overall questionnaire return rates were 58 and 74 percent, respectively, for English and French groups. In addition, a) returns for the French sample arrived much sooner than the English group returns (for example, on the first day of returns 70 French questionnaires were received and only one English questionnaire, a discrepancy which had diminished by the third and fourth subsequent mailing days); and b) the francophone students wrote voluminous comments, some even attaching separate letters, whereas the anglophone students more commonly wrote remarks only when they were called for in a particular item.

No significant differences were found between the two language groups on the questionnaire items concerning "sources of difficulty at McGill," the socio-economic status of parents, satisfaction with academic and social experience at McGill, and the degree to which the student was informed about the university before enrolling. In addition, the differences between the groups on four attitude questions were non-significant (Table 1). The two language groups appeared to be similar both in their distribution of degree enrolment and in the types of occupation they desired.

The following questionnaire items generated significant differences between language groups:

a) In ranking various original reasons for coming to McGill, a surprising percentage of francophone students (16.6%), as compared to the response of their anglophone counterparts (0.6%), indicated that rejection from their first-choice university had been the primary reason for attending McGill. In addition, almost one quarter of their first-ranked reasons for choosing McGill were "a

Table 1
FOUR ATTITUDE QUESTIONS*

	English			French			F	Signif. of F
	Mean	SD	no opinion/no contact	Mean	SD	no opinion/no contact		
In your view, what is the attitude of English-speaking people at McGill towards French-Canadians?	3.8	1.0	11%	3.7	1.0	6%	0.03	ns
What was your opinion of French- ("English" for French sample) Canadians before coming to McGill?	3.9	1.1	8%	3.9	0.9	11%	0.40	ns
What is your opinion of French- ("English" for French sample) Canadians today?	3.9	1.2	7%	3.9	1.0	4%	1.19	ns
In general, how would you describe your contacts with French- ("English" for French sample) speaking people at McGill?	4.4	0.8	17%	4.2	0.8	9%	0.14	ns

* scale: 5 = very favorable/very friendly; 1 = very unfavorable/very unfriendly

Table 2
DEGREE OF SOCIAL CONTACT UNDER VARIOUS CONDITIONS*

	English		French		F	Signif. of F
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
contact with English-speaking McGill students WHILE AT SCHOOL	5.7	0.6	4.4	1.4	25.85	< .001
contact with French-speaking McGill students WHILE AT SCHOOL	3.6	1.5	5.4	0.9	22.87	< .001
contact with English-speaking McGill students OUTSIDE OF SCHOOL	5.0	1.3	2.5	1.7	36.96	< .001
contact with French-speaking McGill students OUTSIDE OF SCHOOL	2.5	1.4	3.7	1.6	7.13	< .01
(FRENCH ONLY) contact with anglophones in general before coming to McGill			3.1	1.8		

* scale: 6 = very frequent; 1 = almost none

desire to study in English.” Nearly half of the anglophone sample (as compared with about one quarter of the francophones) felt that McGill’s reputation was the main reason they had chosen to attend the school, and similarly, close to one-fifth of their first-ranked reasons (as well as for the francophone sample) were the excellence of training for one’s chosen career offered by McGill.

b) The French-Canadian sample differed from their English-Canadian counterparts on the type of linguistic milieu preferred in a work setting, indicating a large degree of preference for a bilingual atmosphere, rather than a unilingual, native-language one. This difference between samples may be due partially to the circumstance that bilingual jobs in Quebec generally offer more opportunities and salary benefits than otherwise; since the francophone students at McGill are, by definition, bilingual, it is likely that a larger percentage of them have the freedom to choose a particular linguistic milieu for a work setting than the anglophone group.

c) Francophone students consistently assigned themselves poorer ratings on English-language ability for writing papers, reading speed, speaking in class, understanding discussions, and participating in informal discussions, although they were matched with anglophones on reading comprehension and understanding lectures.

d) When they were asked about their degree of social contact with students under various conditions, large but expected differences in response between the two language groups resulted (Table 2). The anglophone students had frequent contact with other anglophone McGill students, both within and outside the school setting. Their francophone counterparts, similarly, had frequent contact with francophone McGill students while at school, although this amount declined once the students were outside the school setting. In the analysis of responses from each individual faculty at McGill, this “frequent” contact among francophone students “while at McGill” was still indicated, regardless of whether a particular faculty had a small or large proportion of francophone enrolment. Both groups agreed on having infrequent contact with each other outside McGill, while the anglophones had less frequent contact with francophones while at school than did francophones with anglophones. This seems a reasonable circumstance, given that many anglophone students either have few francophones in their classes or may be unaware of their ethnic background. Finally, the native French-speaking group reported that they had had infrequent contact with anglophones, in general, before coming to McGill.

e) When asked if their parents spoke other than the native language at home, most students indicated that both their parents were monolingual in this setting (Table 3). However, it was interesting to find that, whereas about 16% of the francophones had French-English bilingual parents, as compared with about 7% of the English-speakers, a little more than 25% of the anglophones had bilingual or multilingual parents who spoke miscellaneous languages other than

Table 3

MONOLINGUALISM AND BILINGUALISM OF RESPONDENTS' PARENTS FOR BOTH LANGUAGE GROUPS
(response percentages)

	mother		father	
	English	French	English	French
monolingual parent (English or French)	68.4	81.5	64.7	81.0
English-French (or French-English) bilingual parent	6.5	16.0	8.5	15.9
bilingual or multilingual parent, speaking miscellaneous other languages	25.2	2.5	26.8	3.0
	$\chi^2 = 51.10$ p < .0001		$\chi^2 = 49.06$ p < .0001	

Table 4

POLITICAL VIEWS WITH RESPECT TO FEDERALISM vs. SEPARATISM IN QUEBEC
(adjusted response percentages)*

	English	French
status quo Federalism	60.9	12.0
major constitutional revision	38.3	57.7
sovereignty-association	0.8	20.6
total independence	0.0	9.7
	$\chi^2 = 97.94$ p < .0001	

* This table indicates adjusted percentages, excluding subjects who responded with "no comment."

"no comment": English = 13%
French = 27%

French, in addition to the respondent's native English tongue (the corresponding francophone response was approximately 3%). Thus the anglophone sample seems to have had at least as much exposure to a bilingual environment at home as the native French-speaking group. Similar distributions as those outlined above were obtained for a question about ethnic composition of respondent's living environment.

f) The majority of students from both language groups were living at home or with immediate family (including those who were married). Most of the difference between the two language groups appears to be due to larger percentages of francophone students living away from home, in university residences, apartments, or rooms. This could possibly be a necessity for more francophone students if their homes are not located within commuting distance from the university.

g) A question about respondent's political views with respect to the issue of Quebec's loyalty to the Canadian federation versus its separation from the rest of Canada resulted in a more varied response from francophone students (Table 4). Whereas the majority of anglophones favored the most conservative view of maintaining status quo Federalism, the francophones more commonly supported measures of constitutional revision, sovereignty-association, or total independence. This result may not seem surprising. However, the responses of francophone students attending an English-language university may or may not be as favorable toward certain kinds of political change in Quebec as would be those of the francophone population-at-large in Quebec.

Some additional results obtained were as follows:

a) A certain percentage of students in each language group who felt that their contacts with members of the other group were insufficient offered several reasons for this circumstance, which were ordered in five overall categories (Table 5). The most common reasons noted by both groups were, respectively, time constraints and their personal characteristics (such as shyness, or fear of rejection). More anglophone students indicated that features of McGill's environment led to insufficient contact with francophones, than vice versa.

Table 5

**REASONS NOTED FOR INSUFFICIENT CONTACT WITH
THE OTHER LANGUAGE GROUP FOR BOTH GROUPS
(adjusted response percentages)***

VARIABLE	SUB-CATEGORIES	English	French
time constraints	workload (i.e., academic); family commitments; job; old friends; extra-curricular activities; unspecified time constraints	24	37
language barriers	other group doesn't speak my language well enough; I'm not confident in other language; "communication problem"	14	19
respondent's personal characteristics	timid; shy; unconfident; fear of rejection; not interested in other group; close-minded; unreceptive; hostile toward other group	23	20
McGill environment	environment not conducive to social contact; no or few "others" in program; not enough contact with other group	22	9
cultural differences	they are always working; they are not interested; they are different (e.g., French are too political; English too cold, reserved); both groups "tend to segregate"	17	15

* Only 58% and 60% of English and French respondents, respectively, indicated that their degree of contact with the other language group (i.e., French or English) seemed insufficient and gave the above reasons for this circumstance. The percentages shown have been adjusted to include only these respondents who regarded their contact as insufficient.

b) The French sample only was asked the question (here translated into English) “‘I feel that the longer I am at McGill, the more I fear losing my cultural identity.’ How do you feel about this statement?” An impressive 80% of this group disagreed totally with the statement.

c) The analysis of variance for differences due to campus attended, sex, and year of study, as well as for their interactions with the two language groups or with each other, yielded significant results in a few instances. The specific data for these items are available through the author.

Some conclusions

The findings of this investigation clearly support the assertion in Taylor, Meynard, and Rheault (1977) that “Contact . . . may not be threatening, but nor is it necessarily conducive to interaction with members of the other ethnolinguistic group” (p. 115). These native French-speaking McGill students, while experiencing minimal, if any, threat to their ethnic identity by being in an English-language milieu, did not appear to have much social interaction with native English-speaking students, but rather they socialized with other francophone students in this English-language university milieu. In addition, a large percentage of the francophone sample indicated that they would prefer to continue using the English language within a bilingual French-English work setting.

This lack of social interaction between the groups could lead to the speculation that these native French-speaking students are reasonably satisfied with co-residence in a milieu such as the present one, without an established rapport. Moreover, it seems unlikely that any ethnic stereotypes or prejudices about each other that group members happen to hold upon entering this setting could be significantly altered, given the absence of social interaction between them. Maybe such interaction is not desirable or even necessary, for Taylor and others state that “. . . contact *per se* is not necessarily associated with fear of identity loss” and infer: “Perhaps it is possible in some contexts for bilingualism to flourish, allowing minority members to participate in the larger society while retaining their ethnic and linguistic distinctiveness” (1977, p. 116).

The achievement of a bilingual co-residence of English and French Canadians may, in itself, be a convenient means by which language barriers can be reduced in size. If it were the case, however, that the groups were unsuccessful in gaining a deeper appreciation of each other’s more ethnic-related traditions and values, this bilingual advantage would be represented as a weak, if not counterproductive, mechanism for promoting true social understanding between the ethnolinguistic groups. On the other hand, a more promising model of bilingualism has been created on an experimental level in the form of the “immersion program,” a systematic procedure for educating people in more than one language simultaneously. This work has pioneered with English-speaking children in Quebec (Lambert and Tucker, 1972).

The following excerpts from an account of this Quebec study have promising implications:

... by the end of grade five, the French-trained children had become sufficiently competent in French to be able to communicate naturally with French people and to establish close friendships with French children their own age. They had, in other words, become accepted in French spheres of social activities either as visitors or as potential members of French social groups. In the process, they also developed favorable attitudes toward French people and French ways of life ... they had become at ease in both cultural settings ... they felt identified with both cultural networks (Lambert and Lambert, 1973, pp. 144-145).

Findings consistent with these have subsequently been reported for immersion programs developed in Ontario (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1976) and in the United States (von Maltitz, 1975).

The curious aspect in the case of Quebec's bilingualism is that recent political changes, including the institution of French as the official language of use in the province, are likely to catalyze a trend in the next few years toward inducing the English-speaking population to become more bilingual. This occurrence would presumably facilitate communication between ethnolinguistic groups. However, in the light of the above arguments, the actual extent to which understanding and social interaction follow merely from an ability to communicate must be seriously considered when deciding upon which *specific* measures will be applied toward promoting and fostering bilingualism.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Professor Wallace E. Lambert and Mr. Brian Doan, Department of Psychology, McGill University, who directed this research as part of a course in Advanced Social Psychology, and Mrs Rhonda Amsel of the same department, who directed the data analysis portion of the study.

The questionnaire survey was sponsored by the McGill University Planning Office, whose staff members, Mrs. Junith Barron-Mee, Mrs. Susan Boville, and Ms. Helen Richard, assisted in the preparation of the questionnaire and with the data analysis. The author is grateful for their help as well as for that of all the Planning Office staff. The interpretations of data and views expressed are not necessarily those of this sponsor.

NOTE

1. Copies of any of the following supporting tables are available through the author: 1) Percent of questionnaires returned out of total mailed from eight subgroups; 2) Distribution of degree enrolment for both language groups; 3) Original reasons for coming to McGill: response percentages for first three ranked choices; 4) Sources of difficulty at McGill; 5) Type of occupation desired for both language groups; 6) Type of linguistic milieu preferred in work setting for both language groups; 7) Self-ratings of English-language ability; 8) Socio-economic status of respondents' parents for both language groups; 9) Description of respondent's current living situation; 10) Ethnic composition of respondent's living environment; 11) Degree of satisfaction with experience at McGill; 12) Amount of information received before coming to McGill; 13) " 'Je trouve que plus je passe de temps à McGill, plus je risque de perdre mon identité culturelle.' Comment réagissez-vous à pareille déclaration?" (French sample only).

REFERENCES

- Amir, Yehuda. "Contact Hypothesis in Ethnic Relations." *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 71 (1969), pp. 319-342.
- Clément, Richard, Gardner, Robert C., and Smythe, Padric C. "Motivational Variables in Second-Language Acquisition: A Study of Francophones Learning English." *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, Vol. 9 (April 1977), pp. 123-133.
- Gardner, Robert C. & Lambert Wallace E. *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1972.
- Gardner, Robert C. & Taylor, Donald M. "Ethnic Stereotypes: Their Effects on Person Perception." *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 22 (1968), pp. 267-276.
- Gardner, Robert C., Wonnacott, E. Joy, and Taylor, Donald M. "Ethnic Stereotypes: A Factor Analytic Investigation." *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 22 (1968), pp. 35-44.
- Isaacs, Harold R. *Scratches on Our Minds: American Images of China and India*. New York: John Day Co., 1958.
- Lambert, Wallace E. and Tucker, G. Richard. *Bilingual Education of Children: The St. Lambert Experiment*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1972.
- Lambert, William W. and Lambert, Wallace E. *Social Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, The. "Five Years of Primary French Immersion." Annual reports of the bilingual education project to the Carleton Board of Education and the Ottawa Board of Education up to 1975. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1976.
- Taylor, Donald M. "Bilingualism and Intergroup Relations." In *Bilingualism: Psychological, Social, and Educational Implications*. New York: Academic Press, 1977, pp. 67-75.
- Taylor, Donald M. and Gardner, Robert C. "Bicultural Communication: A Study of Communicational Efficiency and Person Perception." *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, Vol. 2 (1970), pp. 67-81.
- Taylor, Donald M., Meynard, R., and Rheault, E. "Threat to Ethnic Identity and Second-Language Learning." In H. Giles (ed.), *Language, Ethnicity, and Intergroup Relations*. New York: Academic Press, 1977, pp. 99-118.
- von Maltitz, Frances Willard. *Living and Learning in Two Languages: Bilingual-Bicultural Education in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Appendix: Questionnaire

PERSONAL DATA: PLEASE COMPLETE

MALE _____ AGE _____ YEAR (e.g., U1, U3) _____
FEMALE _____ DEGREE (e.g., BSW, BA) _____
MAJOR (e.g., biology, modern languages) _____

1. Consider your original reasons for coming to McGill to study and rank the following in importance (i.e., the most important reason would be ranked "1"). Any item which was of no importance, please leave blank.

My original reasons for coming to McGill:

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) _____ reputation of McGill | e) _____ couldn't get into the university of my first choice |
| b) _____ parental influence | f) _____ to continue my studies in English |
| | _____ (French): to study in English |
| c) _____ chosen discipline available only at McGill | g) _____ to live in Montreal |
| d) _____ excellence of training for chosen career | h) _____ (French only): to be in contact with an anglo-phone cultural milieu |

2. Now that you've been at McGill, have any of the original reasons indicated above changed in priority? If so, please elaborate on the nature of these changes. . .

3. In general, are you satisfied with your overall ACADEMIC experience at McGill thus far?

a) _____ very satisfied b) _____ moderately satisfied c) _____ slightly satisfied
d) _____ somewhat dissatisfied e) _____ very dissatisfied

4. In general, are you satisfied with your overall GENERAL and SOCIAL (i.e., non-academic) experience at McGill thus far?

a) _____ very satisfied b) _____ moderately satisfied c) _____ slightly satisfied
d) _____ somewhat dissatisfied e) _____ very dissatisfied

5. BEFORE coming to McGill, did you receive enough information about study opportunities and conditions at the university?

a) _____ Yes, I was adequately informed. c) _____ No, I was not adequately informed.
b) _____ Yes, I was fairly well informed. d) _____ I had no information at all.

6. Have any of the following been a source of difficulty at McGill and if so, to what extent? Enter one of the following beside each line.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) has been a big problem for me | 3) has only been a slight problem |
| 2) has been a moderate problem | 4) has not been a problem at all |
| a) _____ financial problems | i) _____ difficulty of courses |
| b) _____ ill health | j) _____ difficulties in dealing with the university administration |
| c) _____ difficulty getting to know students | k) _____ insufficient previous training |
| _____ (French) difficulty getting to know anglophone students | l) _____ problems of equivalence of training or proper placement upon entering McGill |
| d) _____ lack of framework and direction in academic program | m) _____ a change in your objectives |
| e) _____ lack of personal counseling | n) _____ (French only) difficulty with the English language |
| f) _____ lack of contact with fellow students | o) _____ other, please specify and rate accordingly _____ |
| g) _____ lack of motivation in my studies | |
| h) _____ lack of facilities for recreation and sports | |

7. What kind of an occupation do you hope to have? (check as many as apply)

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| a) _____ engineering/technological | f) _____ law/politics |
| b) _____ scientific | g) _____ social services |
| c) _____ artistic/cultural | h) _____ business/management |
| d) _____ teaching | i) _____ agriculture/environment |
| e) _____ medical/health care | j) _____ other, please specify _____ |

8. Given the choice, your preferred work setting would be:

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) _____ in a bilingual atmosphere | d) _____ I have no preference regarding any of the above. |
| b) _____ in an English-language atmosphere | e) _____ in a linguistic setting not mentioned above. Please |
| _____ (French) in a French-language atmosphere | |
| c) _____ in a French-language atmosphere | |
| _____ (French) in an English-language atmosphere | |

9. Rate your ability in English with regard to the following by assigning a letter to each according to the following scale:

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| a) Excellent | b) Very good | c) Fairly good | d) Rather poor | e) Very poor |
| _____ Writing papers | _____ Understanding discussions | | | |
| _____ Reading speed | _____ Understanding lectures | | | |
| _____ Reading comprehension | _____ Participating in informal (i.e., social) discussions | | | |
| _____ Speaking in class | | | | |

10. Do either of your parents speak a language other than English at home (or have they done so in the past) on a regular basis? (Please answer "yes" or "no")

mother _____ language(s) spoken _____
father _____ language(s) spoken _____

11. a) What is your father's occupation? Please be specific (e.g., teacher in high school, foreman in mining industry)

- b) What is your mother's occupation? Please specify in a similar manner as (a) above.

12. Please mark the item which best describes your current living situation:

- a) _____ With my parent(s) or immediate family.
b) _____ In a university residence.
c) _____ Other, please specify _____

13. If not living at home, the persons living with or close by you are:

- a) _____ Mainly English-speaking Canadians.
(French) Mainly French-speaking Canadians.
b) _____ Mainly French-speaking Canadians.
(French) Mainly English-speaking Canadians.
c) _____ About half English-speaking and half French-speaking Canadians.
d) _____ Other. Please elaborate.

Complete item 14 by assigning a letter according to the following scale:

- a) Very frequent b) Frequent c) Occasional d) Infrequent e) Very infrequent
f) Almost none

14. i. _____ How much contact with English-speaking McGill students do you have WHILE AT SCHOOL?
ii. _____ How much contact with French-speaking McGill students do you have WHILE AT SCHOOL?
iii. _____ How much contact with English-speaking McGill students do you have OUTSIDE OF SCHOOL?
iv. _____ How much contact with French-speaking McGill students do you have OUTSIDE OF SCHOOL?

15. In your view, what is the attitude of English-speaking people at McGill towards French-Canadians?

- a) _____ Very favourable b) _____ Moderately favourable c) _____ Slightly favourable
d) _____ Somewhat unfavourable e) _____ Very unfavourable
f) _____ No opinion

16. What was your opinion of French-Canadians/(French)English-Canadians before coming to McGill?

- a) _____ Very favourable b) _____ Moderately favourable c) _____ Slightly favourable
d) _____ Somewhat unfavourable e) _____ Very unfavourable
f) _____ No opinion

17. What is your opinion of French-Canadians/(French) English Canadians today?
a) _____Very favourable b) _____Moderately favourable c) _____Slightly favourable d) _____Somewhat unfavourable e) _____Very unfavourable f) _____No opinion
18. In general, how would you describe your contacts with French-speaking/(French) English-speaking people at McGill?
a) _____Very friendly b) _____Somewhat friendly c) _____Slightly friendly d) _____Somewhat unfriendly e) _____Very unfriendly f) _____No regular contact
19. If you feel your contact at McGill with French-speaking Canadians is insufficient, to what do you attribute it?
_____a) to myself. Please elaborate. _____
_____b) to others. Please elaborate. _____
_____c) to insufficient time. Please elaborate. _____
_____d) This does not apply to me. Please elaborate. _____
20. (French only) "Je trouve que plus je passe de temps à McGill, plus je risque de perdre mon identité culturelle". Comment réagissez-vous à pareille déclaration?
a) _____c'est exactement ce que je ressens
b) _____c'est plus ou moins ce que je ressens
c) _____cela reflète un peu mon opinion
d) _____ce n'est pas du tout mon opinion
21. Which of the following most accurately reflects your political views with respect to Federalism vs. Separatism in Québec:
a) _____Status quo Federalism b) _____Major constitutional revision
c) _____Sovereignty-association d) _____Total independence e) _____No comment
22. Have you experienced any unfavourable consequences of your stay at McGill?
_____ no
_____ yes, please elaborate _____
23. What suggestions can you make that might improve McGill's services to its students?

