A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS SUBJECTED TO DIFFERENT TUITION LEVELS AT QUEBEC UNIVERSITIES

A Thesis
Submitted to
The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
McGill University
Montréal, Québec

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts
in
Administration and Policy Studies in Education

© Kim E. Bartlett
August 1984

McGill University

ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY STUDIES IN EDUCATION

SHORT TITLE:

International Students and Tuition Levels in Québec

Kim Bartlett

Postal address: 3724 McTavish Street, Montreal, PQ, Canada H3A 1Y2

ABSTRACT

This study compares selected characteristics of a group of international students exempted from differential fees and those of a group required to pay these fees. The students selected were registered at Québec universities in the academic year 1983-84.

Questionnaire responses were used to compare two randomly selected groups of exempted and non-exempted students for variables including: academic status, funding sources, socio-economic backgrounds and personal significance of fee levels. Percentage distributions and cross-tabulations of responses were generated using the SPSSx Batch system.

A difference was found between the two comparison groups, particularly with regards to socio-economic backgrounds and funding sources. Students from the non-exempted group tended to be from more privileged socio-economic backgrounds and more frequently received award funding, than did students from the exempted group.

This study, therefore, documents a correlation between the level of fees imposed and the compositon of international student enrolment.

RESUME

Cette étude compare un groupe d'étudiants internationaux exemptés des frais de scolarité différentiels et un groupe tenu de payer ces frais selon des caractéristiques déterminées d'avance. Les étudiants sélectionnés étaient inscrits aux universités du Québec pendant l'année académique 1983-84.

Les réponses à un questionnaire établi ont été utilisées pour comparer deux groupes d'étudiants exemptés et non-exemptés sélectionnés au hasard, selon certaines variables dont: le statut académique, les sources de financement, les origines socio-économiques et la signification personnelle des niveaux de frais de scolarité. Les distributions de pourcentages et les corrélations des réponses étaient générées par l'utilisation du système SPSSx Batch.

Une différence est ressortie entre les deux groupes de comparaison en ce qui concerne les origines socio-économiques et les sources de financement. Les étudiants appartenant au groupe de non-exemptés accusaient des origines socio-économiques privilégiées et recevaient des bourses plus fréquemment que ceux du groupe d'exemptés.

Cette étude démontre, par conséguent, une corrélation entre le niveau des frais imposés et la composition des listes d'inscription des étudiants internationaux.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to acknowledge, with sincere thanks, all those who assisted in the preparation of this thesis. Gratitude is expressed to Dr. Donald A. Burgess, the authour's adviser, for his guidance through this endeavour.

Many thanks go to the international students whose willing and generous participation formed the basis of this study. The cooperation and efficiency of the Registrars and staffs of McGill University, Université de Montréal and Ecole Polytechnique in providing data is greatly appreciated. Also acknowledged are the support and advice of Dr. Mildred Burns and Dr. Thomas Eisemon of McGill's Department of Administration and Policy Studies in Education.

Finally, the author thanks Mr. George Tillman of the Canadian Bureau of International Education, in Ottawa, for his consistent interest and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Throughout the development of Canada's post-secondary institutions, international academic exchange has played a significant role. This has been evidenced by: the large number of academic staff of non-Canadian origin in its universities, the graduate level training of many Canadians in foreign institutions and the hosting of international students in Canada's own post-secondary institutions. This study concerns itself with the latter of these themes, namely, international students in Canada and the policies related to them.

Since the end of the Second World War, after which time international enrolment in Canada's universities began its steady increase, these students have received the attention of those both inside and outside of educational organizations. Probably the greatest appreciation has been expressed by host institutions, which have valued the academic, cultural and social contributions made by international students to their university and college environments.

Meanwhile, the function of international students has

been perceived by other interested parties as extending beyond the realm of the academic institution into that of international affairs. The presence of these students has given Canada the opportunity of both repaying educational favours granted by developed countries in the past, as well as sharing its own facilities with still developing nations. The possibility of lasting political links between Canada and other countries have also been seen as a benefit in the hosting of these students. Up until the 1970's, a generally positive perception of the non-Canadian university population allowed international students to carry out their studies in Canada's universities without special restrictions or tuition fees.

During the late 1970's, however, a period of difficult times for the Canadian economy, several provinces introduced the policy of charging international students higher university tuition fees than were paid by Canadians. This followed the trend of a series of policies introduced by the British government during the sixties and seventies. In Canada, less than a decade later, tuition for non-Canadians in some of these provinces had risen to almost ten times the amount required of Canadians. Despite the imposition of these fees, the total number of international students in Canada continued to increase for a few years, leading some observers to conclude that higher tuitions had "not proven greatly deterrent" (Symons & Page, 1984, p. 246).

To date, some advocates of international education have expressed the belief that differential fees may discourage particular groups within the potential non-Canadian student population from enrolling in Canadian universities, namely, promising students of lower socio-economic backgrounds or less-developed nations. It has been suggested by some advocates of educational exchange that this fee policy will alter the composition of Canada's international student enrolment on the basis of individual and national ability to meet higher tuition charges (AUCC, 1979; CBIE, 1983; Symons & Page,1984; Von Zur-Muehlen, 1978a). Interested parties therefore have been calling for research to assess the impact of differential fees upon the make-up of Canada's international student body.

This thesis explores the association between different levels of tuition fees and variations in the composition of the international student population. It does so by examining the extent to which international students exempted and not exempted from differential fees vary in terms of their sources of funding and socio-economic backgrounds, among other things. The exempted and non-exempted groups compared in this study have been drawn from concurrent enrolments of two universities in Montréal, Québec. Québec is particularly approriate for this type of study because, although it requires differential fees of most of its international students, it also exempts a

sizeable number from these fees by means of bilateral education accords which the Province has with some sixteen francophone countries. Thus, it was possible to carry out a qualitative comparison of exempted and non-exempted students while avoiding many drawbacks of other research approaches.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

It is anticipated that the findings of this study will have significance for the field of general research on international students, as well as the modification and formation of policies in this area. Most importantly, the study is designed to gain insight into the effect of the imposition of higher fees on the composition of Canada's international student population, by comparing the social and economic backgrounds of exempted and non-exempted students. This topic has not been adequately explored in the research to date, as Symons and Page (1984) have pointed out.

It is expected that a deeper comprehension of the association between differential fees and variations in the composition of the international student population will assist those responsible for policy making in Canada. Finally, it is hoped that this study will help to improve understanding of international students and their needs among governmental and institutional personnel having responsibility for international students during their

studies in Canadian universities.

THESIS OUTLINE

The information required to place this study in perspective is given in chapters two and three. Chapter two reviews research on international students conducted in Canada since the 1950's. Some significant studies from outside of Canada are also discussed.

The historical background of Canada's international students and the policies of the Federal and provincial governments related to them are surveyed in chapter three. The 1920-1970 period will be covered in the first part of this chapter, drawing heavily on raw enrolment statistics, the main type of data recorded during that period. More recent changes in Canada's international student population will be covered in the chapter's second part, accompanied by a discussion of relevant policies introduced since 1970 including: a new Federal Immigration Act, differential fees and educational accords in Québec.

The research methodology utilized in this study will be outlined in chapter four. Chapter five will present and begin the analysis of the study's findings.

In the final chapter, the findings and analysis of the study will be summarized and discussed. The thesis will conclude with some suggestions for future research in the field.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

In this study the term "international student" is used for a person who has been issued a Student Authorization by the Federal Department of Employment and Immigration for the purpose of study in Canada (CBIE, 1983, p. 2). The descriptions: "foreign student", "non-Canadian student" and "visa student" are also employed in the text with the same intended meaning. It should be noted that, landed immigrants, more accurately called "permanent residents" (AUCC, 1979, p. 2), are not included in any of these categories.

The terms "exempted" and "non-exempted" refer to the international student's status vis-à-vis differential fees, the former signifying that the student is not required to pay the higher fee and the later indicating that the student is obliged to pay the differential.

The term "award" should be read to mean any revenue received by the student from non-personal sources, such as, government or private instititions for use during the study period. The term "award" includes revenues in the form of scholarships, bursaries, grants, prizes, etc.

"Accord" and "non-accord" signifies the standing of a country regarding the signing of bilateral agreements with the Province of Québec. At the time of this study there were sixteen "accord" countries (see Appendix A). It should be noted that although "exempted" students are usually from

"accord" countries and "non-exempted" students usually from "non-accord" countries, exceptions to this general rule do exist, so the terms should not be considered necessarily synonymous or interchangeable.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The body of literature on international students is a mosaic of disciplines, including such studies as education, demography, political science, psychology, economics and statistics. These studies have been conducted under the auspices of governmental and non-governmental bodies, university administrations, as well as behavioural and social science research organizations.

Research on international students in Canada does not have a long history. It was only following World War II, when there was a marked increase in the number of foreign students in Canada (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961a, p. 34), that the topic began to attract the attention of Canadian researchers. Despite the diversity of disciplines and perspectives, most contributions to this field of research have been similar in focus and approach in that they have tended to concentrate on the analysis of policies and programmes related to international students. Generally speaking, the approach to the study of these policies has been prescriptive. This chapter will review the more notable Canadian contributions to the body of literature on international students, along with a few outstanding or characteristic works in the field from outside of Canada.

NON-GOVERNMENT SOURCES

Non-governmental organizations have been the earliest and most prolific source of study and exchange of information on international students in Canada. For example, the National Conference of Canadian Universities held a symposium on international students during the 1950's which brought together government and university representatives. At this conference, Bartlett (1954), Federal officer of Trade and Commerce and administrator of several international student assistance programmes in Canada, called upon Canadian universities and other national organizations to supplement the sources of financial aid available to non-Canadian students. Farlardeau (1954) of Laval University, reported the findings of a nation-wide survey of financial aid for non-Canadian students. Scholarship schemes were found to be lacking in number and coordination. Farlardeau therefore advocated the establishment of a national council to develop a more comprehensive international fellowship plan. Based on statistics indicating a considerable rise in non-Canadian enrolment across the country, the Registrar of Sir George Williams University, Clarke (1954), recommended more efficient admission and orientation procedures to deal with the expanding foreign student population.

In 1961, the National Conference of Universities and Colleges of Canada (NCUCC) set up a committee to investigate

admission procedures for international students at universities across Canada. The Committee made two major recommendations: that universities commence standardized language testing of non-Canadian students and that data on international grading systems be gathered to allow more accurate evaluation of foreign applicants (NCUCC, 1961). The NCUCC was reconstituted as the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) in 1965. Shortly thereafter it commissioned Garneau (1967) to collect student enrolment figures for more than eighty countries then represented at Canadian universities.

In 1968 the AUCC conducted a more detailed survey of non-Canadian students as part of a study commissioned by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) on resources available at Canadian universities for international assistance programmes (Walmsley, 1970). Questionnaires requesting information on the students' country of origin, educational background, source of financial support and field of study were distributed to students through university offices across Canada. Interviews with university officials provided a national picture of the admission policies and procedures for assessment of non-Canadian academic credentials. Following the study, the AUCC recommended that universities re-evaluate their policies in this regard. It also advised that there be more "coordination of the various policies

followed by the immigration department, CIDA, provincial education departments and universities themselves" (p. 118).

In 1979, the AUCC considerably expanded the body of statistical information on international students by collating pertinent data from two Federal Government sources: Statistics Canada and the Department of Manpower and Immigration. More accurate information on the citizenship, age, sex, level and field of study of international students at institutions of higher education in Canada was presented. This 1979 AUCC study was critical as well as reportative, suggesting that the Federal Government's immigration regulations had "probably altered the composition of the foreign student population according to economic background and country of origin" (p. 12). The study also commented on the fact that several provincial governments had introduced policies which raised the level of tuition fees for international students above the level of those for Canadians. It predicted: "differential fees . . . may affect visa student enrolment" (p. 12). The AUCC report concluded that there was little justification for government policies aimed at controlling the rapid growth of the non-Canadian student population, since statistics indicated that international student enrolment had not actually increased "at a rate much greater than total enrolment" (p. 130).

Five years later a report of the AUCC's Commission on

Canadian Studies (Symons & Page, 1984) provided an update on the international student issue and related research. The twenty-four recommendations put forward hinged on the central theme of the need for "a truly national foreign student policy" (p. 248), to be developed by the Federal and provincial governments together, with involvement of educational representatives. The authors of the report pointed out the scarcity of adequately detailed research on the impact of differential fees upon international student enrolment and Canada's own interests - information essential to appropriate policy changes.

The Canadian Bureau of International Education (CBIE), which was originally established in 1966, has been another important source of non-governmental research. Evaluative research on policies relating to foreign students has been a priority of the CBIE since the mid-seventies. The first appearance in Canada of differential fees in 1976 undoubtedly provided the initiative for the series of five works commissioned by the CBIE during the following year. A Patron for the World? (Neice & Braun, 1977) reported on a national survey of post-secondary international students in Canada, which was intended to bring more "enlightenment" into government policy decisions in this respect (p. v). Over seven hundred students at twenty-five Canadian institutions of higher education were interviewed. Information was collected concerning the students'

socio-economic backgrounds, academic characteristics, behaviours, attitudes, aspirations and motivations. One noteworthy finding of the survey was that students coming from the same "World Economic Region" (eg. developing countries) could have radically different socio-economic backgrounds.

Hettich's (1977) report for the CBIE compared the "real" costs of providing education to international students with the less tangible long-term economic benefits. Hettich concluded that Canada stood to gain from this type of activity, not only educationally, but also in economic and diplomatic terms. This wide range of benefits had not previously been realized because most dealings with international students lay in the hands of provincial Ministries of Education, which had concentrated on the provincial concerns of higher education. Shaikh and Simpson's annotated bibliography (1977) further substantiated the CBIE's belief in the fundamental connection between Canada's foreign policy and the hosting of foreign students.

In the same CBIE series, Paterson and Robinson (1977) compiled a listing of Canadian sources of financial assistance for international students. They lamented a "lack of policy coordination between various levels of government, and . . . restrictive legislation at all levels" (p. 21).

Roberts and Modley (1977) provided up-to-date information on admissions, fees and quotas for non-Canadian students. The implications of bilateral educational agreements and national student quotas were also discussed. It was suggested that the Council of provincial Ministers of Education assume the task of formulating coherent policies which were clearly lacking in this area.

A Question of Self Interest (CBIE, 1977) concluded the group of five 1977 CBIE studies. The central thesis of the previous works was reiterated: the hosting of foreign students was in Canada's self-interest. The differential fee policy, which provincial governments had justified with economic arguments, was ill-founded. "Canadian governments, rather than trying to reduce foreign student enrolments, should seek new means to reduce educational costs" (p. 19) in general.

In 1981, the CBIE set up a Commission of representatives from non-governmental education organizations across the country. The Commission's mandate was to review existing institutional and governmental policies regarding international students. The report of the Commission on Foreign Student Policy (1981) furnished historical and statistical background, along with accounts of admission and tuition policies for international students. It also considered the socio-economic composition of the international student population by classifying

students according to the Gross National Product (GNP) of their country of origin, their class level, their family's occupational group and their educational background. The Commission stressed Canada's "responsibility to offer higher educational opportunities to foreign students particularly to those of the Third World" (p. 79). It was advised that prohibitive surcharges (differential fees) be replaced by a scheme combining geographic quotas and scholarships. This would control enrolment, while at the same time ensure access for students from countries in greatest economic need.

In its most recent work, a package of enrolment statistics, the CBIE (1983) reprimanded both the provincial and Federal governments for refusing to "face the issues" (p. 1) of the foreign student policy debate. This study classified and compared the non-Canadian student populations of 1981-82 and 1982-83: by sex, regional and national origin, income level of the country of origin, as well as level, field and institution of study in Canada. One particularly interesting observation on the data commented on the composition of the international student body in terms of income level of country of origin. "Nearly 60% of foreign students here . . . are from high income countries . . . less than 10% are from low-income countries" (p. 2).

As a result of the introduction of differential fees in the Province of Québec, the Fédération des Associations de

Professeurs des Universités du Québec (FAPUQ) carried out a study in 1981. FAPUQ wished to assess the legitimacy of the Québec Government's claim that American citizens were taking advantage of subsidized education in the Province and that higher fees would force these students to make a larger contribution to the real costs of their education. The FAPUQ study did find a substantial number of American students, but also found that the majority of these were studying at the undergraduate level. The study speculated that differential fees would affect not only American undergraduates but also, more importantly, students at all levels from poorer countries. FAPUQ praised the Québec Government's plans for a series of bilateral educational agreements, which would exempt the students of certain developing countries from payment of the higher tuition. The Fédération advised that such agreements would have to be extended to many more countries (both anglophone and francophone) in order to counteract financial barriers created by the differential fee policy.

Insofar as non-governmental organizations are concerned, it is important to note that Canadian university student associations have made a number of significant research contributions since the introduction of differential fees for non-nationals. Traditionally, student associations have opposed in principle fee increases of any kind, particularly those which discriminate against one

segment of the student population. The National Union of Students has strongly criticized the injustice of this government policy (Thibault, 1977; Ballantyne, 1979).

A Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) research paper (Arab, 1983) opposed differential fees and employment restrictions for international students, not only because these measures restricted universal access to education, but also because they indirectly threatened the quality of education offered at Canadian institutions. Recently, the Canadian Federation of Students (Ontario Branch) assisted international students in convincing the provincial government to delay full implementation of the differential fees (CBIE, 1983).

As has been the case here in Canada, most of the non-governmental research conducted in other countries on international students has been either a critical response to a forthcoming policy or, an effort to improve already existing policies or programmes. The British Government's imposition in 1980 of full-cost fees for non-national students prompted the privately funded Overseas Student Trust (OST) to compile the work of commercial, educational and political experts into one volume forming an excellent recapitulation of research trends and findings in Britain and Europe (Williams, 1981). A survey of Britain's international student population (pp. 239-263) was complemented by an analysis of the costs and benefits of

these students to the British economy (chaps. 3 & 4). Foreign policy and development representatives discussed the diplomatic advantages of hosting overseas students and the obligation of Britain to provide educational opportunities for developing countries (chaps. 3 & 4). The full-cost fee policy was viewed by all contributors as highly imperfect.

> A full-cost fee scheme drastically reduces the cost to the British state of overseas students, but it may also involve some loss of benefits if some overseas students are deterred from coming to Britain. (p. 9)

The first recommendation of the OST publication was to move the international student issue out of the realm of domestic politics into the area of foreign affairs. Secondly, it was advised that student selection criterion be more defined, to ensure a balanced representation of rich and poor countries and individuals.

In 1982 the OST commissioned a further study to analyze the existing situation and to make concrete proposals for a more rational future policy for overseas students (Williams, 1982). The central argument against the then current policy was stated at the outset:

> The Government's introduction of full-cost fees for overseas students from September 1980 has yielded substantial public expenditure savings . . . but it has also damaged British interests in the diplomatic and commercial fields. (p. 1)

The OST concluded its policy study by advocating, not a return to indiscriminate subsidy of foreign student education, but a scheme whereby the higher fee schedules

would be coupled with a new overseas student award programme (p. 14). Many of the arguments of the OST were echoed in a report, the same year, by the Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility (1982). This Committee had been established by several Commonwealth leaders to find ways of building education exchanges between their countries. In February 1983, the British Government altered its position by announcing an increase in financial aid for non-British students during the next three years.

In the United States, the non-governmental American Council on Education (ACE) also lamented the failure of policy makers to recognize the importance of international students to higher education and the national interest in general (American Council on Education, 1982). The Council pointed to a resulting absence of effective strategies for dealing with these students. Following a close examination of current government policies and the impact of increased numbers of foreign students upon American institutions of higher learning, the ACE Committee's produced a central recommendation very similar to that of Symons and Page (1984) namely, that the Federal and state governments ought to work together in closer consultation with educational organizations to coordinate national programmes. At an institutional level, American universities and colleges were advised to bring more consistency and responsibility to their dealings with international students on their

campuses.

Another important non-governmental organization in the U.S., the Institute of International Education (IIE), has had a long history of involvement with foreign student issues. Recently the IIE commissioned a study which reported on policy formation and the lack thereof in this area at American colleges and universities (Goodwin & Nacht, 1983). Based on interviews with university administrators and faculty in three states, the IIE study concluded that international students were generally placed low on the list of priorities of institutional officials. Consequently, little attention had been given to the "economic, educational, political and organizational issues associated with large numbers of foreign students" (p. 40). Questions of tuition fees, enrolment quotas, recruitment, foreign student services and new policy initiatives had also been neglected. The authors pointed out in closing that: "absence of decision has more often than not characterized the approach to this issue. This is a luxury, like many others, that we are no longer able to afford" (p. 41).

GOVERNMENT SOURCES

While non-governmental organizations in many countries have explored the international student topic, in Canada a sizeable portion of research in this field has been carried out by governmental offices as well. The first

comprehensive governmental research on this topic was the Dominion Bureau of Statistics' 1961-62 national survey of university student expenditures and income, wherein one part was devoted exclusively to non-Canadians (DBS, 1963). The DBS received 4,263 completed questionnaires from international students of 140 different nationalities attending major universities and colleges in Canada. The number of returns represented approximately one half of the total non-Canadian enrolment during that period (p. 7). This study greatly expanded upon the work of the DBS, which since the 1920's, had been limited to collection of figures on the provincial distribution of international students by students' region or country of origin. Responses to the 1961-62 DBS questionnaires provided previously uncompiled qualitative information on the family and educational backgrounds of international students, their areas and levels of study, opinions of their Canadian study experiences, sources of income, size of expenditure and actual living conditions in Canada. The findings were reported, without extensive comment, in a series of tables and summary notes. In the preface, however, there was mention of the "give and take" of international education and an allusion to some of the broader national obligations and benefits of hosting such students.

> Some 6,000 students leave Canada annually to study abroad and a similar number enter our institutions of higher learning. Having such a number of students from outside Canada living here can be a

> rewarding experience for us. We also have a responsibility for trying to understand them and make their stay profitable. (p. 4)

During the 1970's interest in sources of qualified manpower prompted a survey by Statistics Canada (Ryten, 1972) of student nationalities in graduate programmes at Canadian universities.

Von Zur-Muehlen (1975, 1976a, 1976b, 1977), who is now the statistical authority on foreign students in Canada, made his first contributions to the field with a number of surveys of international enrolment in universities across the country. During the late seventies Von Zur-Muehlen prepared several studies (1978a, 1978b, 1978c) designed to evaluate and update the existing statistics on international students. Figures were already available for: age, sex, legal residence status, nationality, level and field of study. However, a lack of information on the socio-economic backgrounds and the financial problems of these students was noted. Von Zur-Muehlen broke away from a strictly descriptive approach, when he commented on the possible impact of the recently changed tuition fee policies in several provinces. He noted that "the differential foreign student fee in Québec, Ontario and Alberta will, in all likelihood, further inhibit foreign students from these [least developed] countries from coming to Canada" (Von Zur-Muehlen, 1978a, p. 108).

In 1981 Von Zur-Muehlen's work for Statistics Canada

focused specifically on the problem of differential fees and their effect on the size and national composition of the non-Canadian student population. Socio-economic distinctions were incorporated into the statistical data by separating "developed, developing and least developed countries" (pp. 33-35). It was demonstrated that, although there had been an increase in the total number of international students in Canada from 1974 to 1981, there had actually been a decline in the number of students from fourteen "least-developed" countries during that same period.

More recently, Von Zur-Muehlen (1983) has begun work on a more comprehensive statistical account of foreign students in Canada and of Canadian students abroad from the 1970's to the 1980's. Shifts in these populations will be examined in terms of: country of origin, family status, province and institution of study, as well as level and field of study. The impact of the differential fee policy upon the composition of the foreign student body in Canada will also be examined. Other federal departments, in addition to Statistics Canada, have gathered relevant information on international students. The Department of Manpower and Immigration has kept statistics on the citizenship, type of study and educational institution of all those students entering Canada between 1972 and the present with the Department's authorization (AUCC, 1979).

The Department of External Affairs contracted an evaluation of its own scholarship programme for international students in Canada (Schafer, 1977), which concluded that the programme should be expanded immediately. The study suggested that the External Affairs programme had failed to recognize the importance of international students to Canada's economic, social, political, cultural, as well as academic, interests.

UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATIONS

Since the appearance of differential fees in 1976, a number of Canadian university administrations have tried to predict and assess the impact of the higher fees and to devise means of coping with them. The Board of Governors at McMaster University decided not to impose the differential fees legislated by the Ontario Government. A study committee at McMaster proposed that a fund-raising campaign, combined with a quota system for international students would make it possible for McMaster to avoid charging the fees. However, the committee's proposal was deemed economically impractical and rejected. In September 1977, differential fees were put into operation at McMaster, as at all other universities in Ontario.

In 1981, McGill's Graduate Faculty Council established an ad hoc committee to "investigate and monitor the effects of differential fees" on international students (McGill

University, 1982, p. 1). Analysis of administrative records provided precise data on enrolment and the availability of financial assistance for non-Canadian graduate students. Department heads provided their perceptions of the impact of the increased fees on non-Canadian applications and on foreign students already enrolled in programmes. Based on its findings, the Committee concluded that "higher student fees will undoubtedly change the mix of foreign students in Canada by excluding students from low income countries" (p. 2). The Committee recommended the establishment of a university bursary fund to help needy foreign students and the petitioning of the Québec Government to extend its educational agreements to assist more Third World countries.

BEHAVIOURAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

While most of the research of Canadian university administrations has been of the policy study type, the work of the behavioural and social sciences in this area has covered a diversity of approaches. Studies in education, anthropology, sociology and psychology have all dealt with the international student topic. Some educational researchers have followed the trend of non-governmental organizations by concentrating on critical analysis and improvement of existing policies and practices. The comparative education research of Côté (1979) surveyed international academic systems and credentials and the

evaluation of foreign applications at francophone universities in Canada. Côté's study helped to improve these procedures by providing a more complete basis from which student selections could be made.

Zinman-Madoff's (1980) work in education was a case study of governmental and institutional foreign student admission policies at Québec universities. Having administered questionnaires to university admissions directors at seven institutions in the Province, she found that both provincial and Federal government policies were contradictory.

> It [the Québec Government] has attempted to foster foreign student admissions by increased funding of student aid programmes for visa students, while . . . it has imposed a differential fee structure which may be a deterrent to foreign student enrolment. Likewise, although the Federal Government actively participates in academic exchanges . . . the Immigration Act of 1977 includes regulations which discourage some foreign student applicants. (pp. 96-97)

Zinman-Madoff recommended that government and educational institutions begin a public education campaign concerning the benefits of the international student presence to Canada; reconsider the differential fee and other restrictive policies; and expand services and opportunities for international students in Canada.

Although much of behavioural and social science research in Canada has been focused on the analysis of governmental and institutional policies, other studies have concentrated instead on international students themselves.

It is appropriate to mention here that this approach has characterized much of the research on international students in the United States (Cormack, 1968; Spaulding, Flack, Tate, Mahan & Marshall, 1976; Speakman, 1966).

Since the early fifties, psychologists, anthropologists and sociologists in the U.S. have been studying the adaptation processes of international students; their social interaction with Americans; and the reaction of American society to these visiting students (Cormack, 1962, 1968). Klineberg (1970,1976; Klineberg & Hull, 1979) has been particularly prolific on the topic of foreign student adaptation. The attitudes and adjustments of foreign students following their return home also attracted considerable attention (Cormack, 1968; Flack, 1976). During the 1960's the United States Government used these post-return attitudinal studies of students to estimate the success of its educational exchange programmes (Speakman, 1966; United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, 1963). The Institute of International Education (IIE) conducted attitudinal surveys of Africans both during and after their period of study in the United States (Davis, Hanson & Burnor, 1961).

In Canada, Young's educational counselling research (1965) looked at the backgrounds and adjustment strategies of Hong Kong students at Canadian universities.

A study by anthropologist Genest (1972) was concerned

with the impact of the Canadian study experience upon African students. About fifty Africans studying at French and English universities in Canada were interviewed. Questions dealt with academic and social adaptation, attitudes towards Canadians and future professional and academic plans. Students were also asked about their family and educational backgrounds and their sources of financial support. Based on the findings, Genest constructed an African student profile, which reaffirmed those of previous American and Canadian studies (Davis, Hanson & Burnor, 1961; Walmsley, 1970). Genest, however, noted that it would be necessary to conduct more comprehensive comparative and longitudinal studies in order to really determine the academic, professional and social impact of the Canadian study period upon the African students.

Québec sociologist Dofney oversaw the Canadian segment of a multi-national survey of international students organized by the Australian National University (Roa, 1979). Returns from a comprehensive personal questionnaire formed the data base of this international study on the problem of "Brain Drain". Particular attention was given to the factors and attitudes associated with the decision of individual students not to return home after completing their study period abroad.

Lambert (1981) conducted a psychological study of attitudes and adjustment strategies of international

students at McGill University. Responses to questionnaires indicated that student morale was contingent upon nationality, language facility, financial resources and the quality of social contacts with Canadians. Lambert's research also revealed that many non-Canadian students found university advisory and counselling services to be inadequate.

In recent years the administrative offices of various Canadian universities have also carried out research projects, that have focused on the international student. The Counselling Service of Waterloo University conducted a survey of the experiences of its international students, with particular emphasis on attitudes towards Canada and Canadians (Williams & Knapper, 1980). The University of Alberta's Office of Student Affairs and International Student Advising has investigated the use of international students as an educational resource in the Canadian community (Groberman, 1982).

In 1982, a task force made up of representatives from the Dean of Students, the Learning Development Office and the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Concordia University submitted a report to its Vice-Rector (Magnan, Morey, & Russell, 1982). The report was based on a two year interview-study of international students, faculty and non-academic staff at the University. The social, cultural and academic problems of non-Canadian students, as perceived

by the students themselves and university staff members were examined. Particular attention was given to foreign students' experiences of discrimination. Based upon the data, cultural profiles of students from different regions were constructed. The prevalent attitudes of university staff members towards this non-Canadian population were also presented. The study found that many adjustment problems were rooted in the students' lack of language proficiency and lack of comprehension of bureaucratic procedures. It was therefore recommended that the existing methods of testing facility in the English language be revieved and coordinated with actual needs. A compulsory international student orientation programme was also suggested. Magnan, Morey and Russell, expanding further on their recommendations, advised the Concordia administration to undertake a fundamental re-evaluation of current procedures, to arrive at "a consistent and sensitive policy . . . concerning international students at Concordia" (p. viii).

SUMMARY

The topic of international students has fallen under a wide variety of research disciplines in Canada and around the world. Most of the research, regardless of its source or methodology, has been directed towards the analysis and improvement of policies and practices. During the late 1970's, the introduction of differential fees in several

Canadian provinces stimulated a new surge of policy research in this field. Most studies from non-governmental organizations in Canada, such as the AUCC, CBIE, FAPUQ, NUS and CFS have been critical responses to these policies. Meanwhile in Britain and the United States, the OST and the ACE and IIE respectively have carried out policy studies appropriate to their own particular situations.

In Canada, government researchers (Von Zur-Muehlen in particular) have concentrated on the compilation of broadly based, quantitative enrolment data as a means of determining how new policies have affected or will affect the country's international student population. The behavioural and social sciences and university administrations have provided bases for policy critiques with case studies and more individualized studies of international students. All research has called for critical analysis of existing policies for international students in Canada and discussion of its possible implications. The most recent research has cited the need for more detailed information concerning the socio-economic backgrounds of international students. Only with such information will it be possible to make important distinctions within a heterogeneous foreign student population and thereby to determine the precise effect of the differential fee policies (AUCC,1979; Commission on Foreign Student Policy, 1981; CBIE, 1983; Von Zur-Muehlen, 1978a, 1983).

Throughout the literature reviewed in this chapter, the qualitative impact of the differential fee policy upon Canada's international student population has been emphasized as an area for further study.

CHAPTER III

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND CANADIAN GOVERNMENT POLICIES

It has only been during the past sixty years or so, that substantial numbers of international students have enrolled in the universities of Canada. This chapter will survey the history of Canada's international student enrolment and the policies of the Canadian Federal and provincial governments which have related to them.

The evolution of Canada's international student population from 1920 to 1970 and the relevant activities of government during this period will be discussed in the first section of this chapter. The changes in Canada's international student body which have taken place since 1970 will be covered in the second section, chiefly in the context of three recent and significant governmental policy developments: a new Federal Immigration Act; the introduction of differential fees in several provinces; and the establishment of educational accords between Québec and a number of French-speaking countries.

PART 1

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND GOVERNMENT REACTION: 1920-1970

Widespread enrolment of non-national students in Canada has been a relatively recent occurrence. Canada has not been alone on the continent in this respect; the movement of substantial numbers of international students into North America as a whole did not begin until the beginning of the twentieth century. Prior to this date, Québec's Catholic Laval University occasionally hosted religiously affiliated students from abroad (Walmsley, 1970) and Maritime universities attracted some students from the West Indies (Blizzard, 1970). For the most part, however, North American institutions of higher learning were geographically inaccessible to most of the global student population or were viewed as academically inferior relative to European schools (Cieslak, 1955).

During the 1920's, long-distance travel at cheaper rates increased both the access and awareness of international study opportunities and more "foreign" students appeared on university campuses not only in North America but around the world (Speakman, 1966). During the twenties and thirties much of the world-wide movement of young scholars took place between countries within either Europe or North America. In the British and French Empires, some more privileged students from the colonies were able to

travel to the mother country to obtain higher education.

Immediately after World War II, there was a boom in international and trans-oceanic student travel that led to a substantial influx of students from overseas countries in North America. In the United States, a non-national student population, which had remained relatively constant during the twenties and thirties (about 6,000), doubled in 1946 and doubled again five years later (Cieslak, 1955, p. 9).

Meanwhile the body of international students in Canada's universities also grew, somewhat more gradually than in the U.S., and underwent a marked transformation in terms of national composition (see Table 1). While the majority of non-nationals studying in Canada during the thirties had been American and British, by 1950 almost 40% of international students in Canada were coming from countries (most of them developing ones) other than the United States and Britain.

It was during the fifties that the Canadian Federal Government began to demonstrate an interest in this slowly expanding student population by introducing Canada's first educational assistance programmes for students from developing regions and by allowing non-national students to compete for various Canadian study and research fellowships.

The Colombo Plan Technical Cooperation Scheme was initiated in 1951 under the sponsorship of Canada, together with Britain, Australia and New Zealand. Advanced technical

Table 1

International Students Enrolled Full-Time in Canadian Universities and Colleges: 1921-1950

	Country or Region of Origin of Students					
Year	USA	United Kingdom	British West Indies	Other Countries	Total Non-Canadian	Total Canadian University Enrolment
1920-21	-	-	-	-	1,306	33,012
1925-26	934	133	64	236	1,367	32,998
1930-31	1,506	333	54	236	2,129	42,914
1935-36	2,018	156	32	237	2,443	44,224
1936-37	2,247	140	29	219	2,635	49,397
1937-38	2,128	101	34	210	2,473	49,326
1938-39	1,914	98	38	233	2,283	49,165
1939-40	1,478	41	74	289	1,882	47,346
1945-46	1,116	167	263	507	2,053	65,704
1946-47	1,705	79	294	778	2,856	82,154
1947-48	1,768	140	317	933	3,158	82,746
1948-49	1,759	158	279	825	3,021	75,833
1949-50	1,875	176	288	909	3,248	70,208

SOURCE: Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Higher Education in Canada, 1938-40, 1946-48, 1948-50. Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier, 1941-1952.

training was made available in the universities of sponsor countries to students from developing areas in Asia in order to promote economic growth in that region. In Canada, the Federal Department of Trade and Commerce administered and financed the first such programme in the country. The Department also administered a technical programme funded by the United Nations which brought students from poorer world regions to Canada. In 1954, forty students from developing areas were studying in Canada under either the Colombo or United Nations programme.

After World War II, the Federal Government had opened some study opportunities to international students by allowing non-Canadian British subjects to compete for two National Research Council (NRC) science fellowships. By 1954, three NRC competitions were open to international students without any nationality specifications. non-Canadian graduate students were also eligible for the limited number of fellowships awarded by the Canadian Social Sciences Council and the Humanities Research Council in the late fifties (UNESCO, 1954b, 1958b).

In 1960, Canada's international student population was twice as large as it had been ten years earlier. Table 2 shows that enrolment from the U.S. and Britain had risen slightly during the decade, while the number of students from all other countries had more than tripled, constituting 60% of Canada's total international enrolment.

Table 2

International Students Enrolled Full-Time in Canadian Universities and Colleges: 1950-1960

	Country or Region of Origin of Students					
Year	USA	United Kingdom	British West Indies	Other Countries	Total Non-Canadian	Total Canadian University Enrolment
1950-51	1,758	164	252	1,014	3,188	68,306
1954-55	1,501	208	502	1,536	3,748	69,320
1955-56	1,773	281	635	1,696	4,385	72,737
1956-57	1,719	297	726	1,885	4,627	78,504
1957-58	1,788	385	905	2,286	5,364	86,754
1958-59	1,984	526	1,018	2,460	5,988	94,994
1959-60	2,035	531	1,085	2,782	6,433	101,934

SOURCE: Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Survey of Higher Education, 1954-61. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1963.

Although the Federal Government of Canada displayed some interest in international students through technical assistance and award programmes during the fifties, its efforts in this area were still relatively small when compared both to actual numbers of international students and to Canada's obligations to reciprocate opportunities provided for its own students in other countries.

The Federal Government claimed that all educational matters, international students included, were the responsibility of the provinces. Though this may have been indicated in the B.N.A. Act, in the past, the Federal Government had nonetheless exerted considerable influence on higher education in Canada. Ottawa, for instance, had been supplying grants to a number of Canadian universities since the mid-forties, except in Québec where they were refused by Premier Duplessis. The nation's scientific research had also been steered indirectly by federal NRC funding programmes (Zinman-Madoff, 1980). Based on such precedents, some advocates of international education in Canada were hopeful that Ottawa would take more initiative with regards to non-Canadian students in the country (Farlardeau, 1954).

In 1960, the Federal Government began to demonstrate more commitment. It established an External Aid Office (EAO) as a distinct department under the Secretary of State for External Affairs, which took over the functions of the Colombo programme. The EAO also assumed responsibility for

a new "Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan", which had been introduced in 1960 on the recommendation of the Federal Secretary of State for External Affairs (Walmsley, 1970). This plan provided 250 funded study positions in Canada for students from the developing Commonwealth in 1960-61 (UNESCO, 1960b). The Colombo and Commonwealth programmes were complemented with other smaller federal schemes which also brought international students to Canada during the late fifties and early sixties, namely: the Caribbean Assistance Programme (1958); the Special Commonwealth Africa Assistance Plan (1959); and the Independent French-speaking African States Aid Programme (1961) (Walmsley, 1970, p. 229).

In 1961, the Education Director of the new Federal EAO, attended a meeting of the National Conference of Canadian Universities and Colleges (NCCUC) at which he urged Canada's universities to become more concertedly responsive to their international enrolments. In response to the Government's suggestion, the NCCUC set up a committee devoted to the "problems of foreign students in Canada" (NCCUC, 1961, p. 23) and soon after, established a permanent International Programmes Division (IPD), which became the first communicative and administrative link between the Federal Government and the academic community regarding international activities in higher education. By 1965, when the NCCUC was reconstituted as the Association of

Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), the Federal Government had already delegated its administrative responsibility for 250 "Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan" awards to the IPD, solidifying the cooperative relationship between government and Canada's national university association (UNESCO, 1963b).

During the sixties the Federal Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) continued to offer study opportunities in Canada to international students by deeming them eligible for a number of its scholarships. In 1968, the Canada Council initiated a federal award programme exclusively for non-Canadian students, which, in its first year of operation, offered seven graduate scholarships to nationals of Belgium, Switzerland and France (UNESCO, 1966b). The total number of awards for these three countries was increased to 120 in 1968-1969 (UNESCO, 1968b). Throughout the sixties, the Canadian Medical Research Council also permitted international students to compete for its limited number of awards (UNESCO, 1963b, 1966b). The National Research Council (NRC), on the other hand, began to deplete award opportunities for non-Canadians during the late sixties. By 1969-70, all NRC fellowship contests were restricted to Canadians only.

The most expansive effort of the Federal Government, with respect to international students during the 1960's was the continuing Colombo Technical Assistance Plan. This

programme, funded and administered by the Federal EAO, brought 1,125 students from developing countries to Canadian universities in 1964 and two years later increased the number of those sponsored to 1,310 (UNESCO, 1966b, 1968b).

In 1968 the EAO took a new name, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and divided its activities between bilateral aid and technical assistance. It provided more educational opportunities to students from developing countries by expanding the EAO's Colombo scheme. In September 1968, 2,100 foreign trainees came to Canadian educational institutions under the renamed CIDA Technical Assistance Programme. Recipients of awards were selected on the basis of nominations by their home governments and were then placed in suitable institutions by CIDA, in collaboration with the IPD. CIDA also made arrangements with various Canadian universities for the training of students sponsored by other international organizations and negotiated specialized contracts with universities, at which there were large numbers of CIDA sponsored students (Walmsley, 1970).

Although the CIDA programme was receiving the largest single Federal allocation for international student assistance during the late sixties, it represented only a small percentage of CIDA's total budget and reached less than ten percent of the international students then in Canada (Walmsley, 1970). Although the Federal Government

had demonstrated more interest in Canada's international relations during the sixties, it had not emphasized the hosting of international students as a component of this task.

Generally speaking, the provincial governments who were responsible for education according to the Canadian constitution did not formally distinguish international students during the sixties. Non-specific provincial support of students, however, had come in the form of international students' tuition fees which, like those of Canadian students, were subsidized by the provinces according to the Fiscal Arrangements Agreement of 1967 (Von Zur-Muehlen, 1978). In Québec, one exception to this norm was a programme which was specifically addressed to students in France. In 1968, the newly established Québec Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs, offered approximately seventy-five bursaries to citizens of France for study in Québec universities. In 1970, the number of bursaries was increased to 150 (UNESCO, 1968b, 1969b, 1971b), probably contributing to a rise in Québec's student enrolment from France between 1967 and 1970 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1968b, 1969b, 1970a).

By the end of the 1960's, international student enrolment for all of Canada had risen to almost 20,000 (see Table 3), with the most significant growth occurring in the developing countries' enrolment.

Table 3

International Students Enrolled Full-Time in Canadian Universities and Colleges By Country or Region of Origin: 1960-1970

Year	USA	United Kingdom	Africa	Asia, Including Middle East	South America	Central America and Mexico	West Indies	Other Countries and Regions	Total Non-Canadian	Total Canadian University Enrolment
1960-61	2,362	582	233	1,615	199	79	1,318	863	7,251	113,864
1961-62	2,660	577	409	1,785	197	60	1,349	863	7,900	128,894
1962-63	2,845	650	490	2,023	231	70	1,268	941	8,518	141,388
1963-64	3,193	687	499	2,498	240	80	1,309	984	9,490	158,388
1964-65	3,283	715	599	2,836	251	95	1,302	1,073	10,154	178,238
1965-66	3,395	886	672	3,430	296	99	1,205	1,301	11,284	205,888
1966-67	3,549	851	918	4,395	359	94	1,257	1,520	12,943	232,672
1967-68	3,910	1,042	1,100	5,472	396	107	1,370	1,959	15,356	261,207
1968-69	4,570	1,403	1,171	6,117	449	105	1,373	2,235	17,423	270,093
1969-70	5,029	2,134	1,353	6,275	2,239			2,891	19,921	299,889

SOURCE: Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Survey of Higher Education 1946-1970. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1950-1970.

Summary

The first section of this chapter has surveyed international student enrolment in Canadian universities and concurrent government responses to this population from 1920 to 1970. Although international students had already been present at some Canadian universities in earlier years, it was not until the 1950's that the Federal Government gave concrete recognition to their growing numbers by implementing a number of study assistance programmes. These programmes characterized government response to international students during the fifties and sixties.

Although the sources of funding offered to non-national students by the Canadian Government were numerous during this period, it should be noted that Ottawa informally provided encouragement and assistance to the national university associations (NCCUC and AUCC) regarding international education. It should also be stated that neither the Federal nor the provincial governments implemented any policies that specifically discouraged international enrolment in Canadian universities. Ottawa and the provinces accorded international students the same tuition levels as Canadians, by sharing the subsidization of these students' education costs. Until the seventies, international students were also permitted to seek part-time employment to help finance their studies. In most respects, both levels of government maintained a laissez-faire

attitude towards international students during this period.

PART 2

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND RECENT POLICY: 1970-1984

Statistical Survey of International Student Enrolment

At the outset of this statistical survey of international student enrolment after 1970, it is appropriate to mention the discrepancy which exists between the two main sources of data for this period, namely: the Dominion Bureau of Statistics (later, Statistics Canada) and the Department of Manpower and Immigration (later, Employment and Immigration Canada). Also, variations can occasionally be found in different tabulations from the same source. These statistical irregularities, which seem to originate from the varied methods and time frames used for data collection, provided the topic for a complete study by Von Zur-Muehlen (1976a) and have also been discussed in more recent works, where it has been said that although more complete data on international students are desired, "those which are available are adequate for developing most policy options" (Von Zur-Muehlen, 1978, p. 118).

For the purposes of this chapter, it was found that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics/Statistics Canada provided the most complete and accessible sources for the 1920-1973 period and that after 1973 the Department of Immigration student data were the most detailed and continuous.

Accordingly, these sources were referenced for the respective periods. In Table 4, the Department of Immigration figures have been given alongside the Statistics Canada totals for the sake of comparison and to indicate the transition, in this section of the chapter, from one source of data to another.

In the early 1970's, the flow of university students into Canada underwent a significant transition. For the first time, the number of students coming to Canada from other countries substantially exceeded the number of Canadians studying abroad. Enrolment of full-time international students in Canada went up by more than 10,000 between 1970 and 1973, reaching a peak of 33,367 in 1972 (see Table 4). Increases occurred in the number of students from almost all world regions during this period. The highest increase from a single country was that of Britain, which leapt almost three hundred percent, from 2,134 in 1969-70 to 6,128 in 1973, possibly in anticipation of increases in British university fees for both home and overseas students to be introduced in 1974 (Williams, 1981, p. 35).

In 1973-74, Department of Immigration sources indicated that the number of international students in Canada had decreased to less than 15,000, following the enrolment peak of the previous year. The total number of non-Canadian students in Canada leveled off in 1974-75, however, and

Table 4

International Students Enrolled in Canadian Universities by Region of Origin: 1970-1974

Year	North America	Europe	Africa	Middle-East	Asia	Latin America	Caribbean	Oceania	Other Regions	Total Non-Canadian	Total Canadian University Enrolment
1970-71	5,524 [US-5,366]a	5,261 [UK-3,816]	1,329	1,035	6,327	740	1,552	495	113	22,376 (13,343)b	303,510
1971-72	5,934 [US-5,820]	10,316 [UK-5,545]	1,397	1,217	6,689	837	1,811	557	-	28,758 (15,889)	318,955
1972-73	7,289 [US-7,154]	11,402 [UK-6,128]	1,594	1,423	8,028	952	2,018	661	-	33,367 (18,987)	315,278
1973-74	6,061 [US-5,899]	7,689 [UK-4,152]	1,614	1,082	7,030	811	1,619	398	-	26,304 (14,340)	327,189

Amounts in brackets [ ] are included in regional totals.

Amounts in parentheses ( ) are Department of Manpower and Immigration figures.

SOURCES: Statistics Canada. Fall Enrolment in Universities and Colleges: 1970-1974. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1972-1976.

Von Zur-Muehlen, M. Foreign Students in Canada: Notes on Some Unresolved Issues. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1987.

continued to rise steadily thereafter in every Canadian province, reaching a total of 29,380 in 1977 (see Table 5 and Table 6). The most significant increases during this period were those of Asia and South America, both of which more than tripled their student enrolment in Canada between 1973 and 1977. Hong Kong students were the fastest growing national group, increasing from 2,115 in 1973 to 9,397 in 1977 (Von Zur-Muehlen, 1978, p. 46). Enrolment from Europe, Africa, Central America and the Caribbean each more or less doubled. The U.S. contingent was the only one which declined.

When these countries were grouped according to stage of economic development, as in Table 7, it was evident that from 1975 to 1977 enrolment from the "Oil-Rich" and "Semi-Industrialized" countries had experienced the greatest increases. The lowest rates were seen in the "Least Developed" and "Developing" categories, mainly comprising African countries.

After 1977, Canada's international student population faced the implementation of new immigration regulations, differential fees and international educational accords. These policy developments will be discussed more fully in the following sections. As shown in Table 8, non-Canadian student enrolment from most world regions (except the Middle East) increased or remained almost constant in Canada during the early eighties. The total number of international

Table 5

International Students Enrolled in Canadian Universities by Country or Region of Origin: 1974-1977

Year	USA	Europe	Africa	Asia	Central America	South America	Caribbean	Australia	Total Non-Canadian [a]	Total Canadian University Enrolment
1974	5,970	1,197	2,280	6,226	276	541	1,363	149	18,035	495,905
1975	6,062	1,568	2,875	10,146	413	952	1,769	176	24,004	530,259
1976	5,849	1,943	3,350	13,780	509	1,561	2,163	228	29,436	558,933
1977	4,728	2,008	3,368	14,706	468	1,681	2,156	189	29,380	539,494

[a] "Non-Canadian" totals include students from all other non-specified regions.

SOURCE: Von Zur-Muehlen, M. Foreign Students in Canada and Canadian Students Abroad. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1978.

Table 6

International University Students by Intended Province, 1973 to 1977

Province	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
Newfoundland	83 (0.6)	127 (0.7)	142 (0.6)	163 (0.6)	193 (0.7)
Prince Edward Island	61 (0.4)	61 (0.3)	67 (0.3)	58 (0.2)	62 (0.2)
Nova Scotia	927 (6.5)	1,189 (6.8)	1,137 (4.8)	1,334 (4.6)	1,463 (5.1)
New Brunswick	264 (1.9)	289 (1.6)	310 (1.3)	416 (1.4)	454 (1.6)
Quebec	4,650 (32.8)	5,494 (31.4)	6,771 (28.9)	8,164 (28.4)	8,105 (28.2)
Ontario	5,675 (40.0)	6,991 (40.0)	9,757 (41.7)	11,631 (40.5)	11,370 (39.6)
Manitoba	449 (3.2)	703 (4.0)	1,070 (4.6)	1,406 (4.9)	1,623 (5.6)
Saskatchewan	250 (1.8)	386 (2.2)	896 (3.8)	1,633 (5.7)	1,379 (4.8)
Alberta	865 (6.1)	1,219 (7.0)	2,006 (8.6)	2,304 (8.0)	2,262 (7.9)
British Columbia	952 (6.7)	1,030 (5.9)	1,243 (5.3)	1,616 (5.6)	1,770 (6.2)
Sub-total	14,176 (100.0)	17,489 (100.0)	23,399 (100.0)	28,725 (100.0)	28,681 (100.0)
Other University-related institutions	774	546	605	711	699
Total	14,950	18,035	24,004	29,436	29,380
Percentage change over previous year		+20.6%	+33.1%	+22.6%	-0.2%

Note. Percentage figures by province in brackets

SOURCE: Von Zur-Muehlen, M. Foreign Students in Canada and Canadian Students Abroad. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1978.

Table 7

International Students Enrolled in Canadian Universities by Country Grouping at Various Stages of Economic Development: 1975-1977

Country Grouping	1975	1976	1977
Industrialized[a] Countries	2,160	2,713	2,666
Hong Kong	6,378	9,027	9,397
USA	6,065	5,849	4,728
Oil Rich[b] Countries	855	1,386	1,543
Semi-Industrialized[c] Countries	2,082	2,839	3,219
Developing[d] Countries	3,276	3,925	3,873
West Indies and[e] Other Islands	1,722	2,082	4,728
Guyana	469	600	592
Least Developed[f] Countries	987	1,078	1,149

Note. See Appendix B for complete breakdown of country groupings.

SOURCE: Von Zur-Muehlen, M. Foreign Students in Canada and Canadian Students Abroad. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1978.

students enrolled in Canadian universities in 1982-83 was approximately 45,000.

Table 9, which classifies enrolment in the late seventies according to income level of the students' country of origin, shows that it was the "High Income" countries (led by Hong Kong) whose enrolments had gone up during the period since the implementation of differential fees. At the same time, the number of students from the "Middle" and "Low Income" national groups underwent a net decline. A tabulation of student enrolment from those countries, which the United Nations termed "Least Developed", , showed decreases for fourteen countries between 1979-80 and 1980-81 (Von Zur-Muehlen, 1981, p. 35). Therefore, although figures showed that there were more international students than ever in Canada, there had been a marked decline in numbers from poorer nations.

Similarly, international student enrolments in every Canadian region or province showed increases, when viewed in absolute terms (see Table 10). However, when examined in detail and over a longer period of time, regional figures depicted other enrolment trends. In Table 11, enrolment figures are shown individually for several Canadian universities, that have hosted large numbers of international students. The most drastic decline in international enrolment during the early eighties occurred

Table 8

International Students at Canadian Post-Secondary Institutions
By Region or Country of Origin: 1980-1983.

Year	USA	Europe	Africa	Middle-East	Asia	Central, South America & Caribbean	Austral-asia	Total International Students	Total Canadian University Enrolment
1980-81[b]	4,168	3,301	3,973	2,084	15,151	4,303	259	33,239	382,617[d]
1981-82[c]	4,361	4,002	5,251	2,174	18,575	4,808	913	40,084	401,911[d]
1982-83[a] [d]	4,265	4,335	6,866	1,911	21,534	4,965	859	44,735	not available

SOURCES: [a]1982-83 figures include post-secondary trade institutions.

[b]Commission on Foreign Student Policy. The Right Mix. Ottawa: CBIE, 1981.

[c]CBIE. Statistics on Foreign Students 1981-82, 1982-83. Ottawa: CBIE, 1983.

[d]Statistics Canada. Universities: Enrolment and Degrees. Ottawa: Department of Supply and Services, 1983-84.

Table 9

International Students Enrolled in Secondary and Post-Secondary Institutions by Income Level of Country of Origin

Income Level	1980-81[a]	1981-82[b]	1982-83[b]
High (GNP over $2,500. US)	24,515	27,550	30,378
Middle (GNP between $400. and $2,500. US)	15,723	12,505	12,737
Low (GNP under $400. US)	3,789	2,916	3,723

Note. 1981-82 and 1982-83 figures include primary school level international enrolment.

SOURCES: [a]Commission on Foreign Student Policy. The Right Mix. Ottawa: CBIE, 1981.

[b]CBIE Statistics on Foreign Students: 1981-82, 1982-83. Ottawa: CBIE, 1983.

Table 10

International Students by Canadian Provinces and Regions: 1978-1983

Region or Province	1978[a]	1979[a]	1980[a]	1981[b]	1982[b]
ATLANTIC					
Newfoundland				206	210
Prince Edward Island	2,109	2,094	2,252	32	25
Nova Scotia				1,463	1,662
New Brunswick				693	807
Quebec	6,644	6,586	6,689	7,057	7,224
Ontario	10,524	11,157	13,138	16,899	18,862
WESTERN					
Manitoba				1,518	1,970
Saskatchewan	6,483	5,847	5,766	766	852
Alberta				2,019	2,338
British Columbia				2,753	2,953
TOTAL	25,760	25,684	27,845	33,412	36,906

SOURCES: [a]Von Zur-Muehlen, M. Foreign Students in Canada - A Preliminary Documentation for 1981-82. Unpublished draft, 1981. (available from Statistics Canada)

[b]CBIE. Statistics on Foreign Students, 1981-82, 1982-83. Ottawa: CBIE, 1983.

Table 11

Canadian Universities with Large International Student Enrolments: 1978-1983

University, Province	1978-79[a]	1979-80[a]	1980-81[a]	1981-82[a]	1982-83[b]
Toronto, Ont.	2,907(6.4)	2,953(6.3)	3,101(6.5)	3,876(11.1)	3,757(10.8)
McGill, Que.	2,475(12.7)	2,464(12.2)	2,559(12.8)	2,766(16.6)	2,765(16.2)
York, Ont.	1,007(4.4)	1,021(4.5)	1,288(5.3)	1,765(13.5)	2,356(15.7)
Windsor, Ont.	894(8.8)	999(9.6)	1,340(12.5)	1,986(26.7)	2,277(27.4)
Alberta, Alta.	1,229(5.5)	1,134(5.2)	1,205(5.4)	1,408(7.2)	1,638(11.2)
Ottawa, Ont.	955(5.4)	1,211(6.5)	1,269(6.9)	1,337(11.0)	1,409(11.2)
Manitoba, Man.	1,247(6.4)	1,134(6.1)	1,098(5.8)	1,188(8.5)	1,386(9.1)
Concordia, Que.	2,080(9.2)	1,922(8.2)	1,950(7.8)	1,433*	1,382(12.0)
Simon Fraser, B.C.	850*(9.3)	850*(9.1)	1,000*(8.8)	1,247(23.7)	1,269(23.1)
British Columbia, B.C.	791(3.2)	823(3.3)	810(3.2)	994(5.0)	1,102(5.3)
Laval, Que.	552(2.4)	509(2.1)	6.9(2.5)	711(3.9)	793(4.2)

Note. Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of University's Total full-time enrolment.

Asterisks indicate estimated amounts.

SOURCES: [a]Von Zur-Muehlen, M. Foreign Students in Canada - A Preliminary Documentation for 1981-82. Unpublished draft, 1981. (available from Statistics Canada).

[b]CBIE. Statistics on Foreign Students 1981-82, 1982-83. Ottawa: CBIE, 1983.

at Concordia University in Montréal, Québec. This seems to reinforce the findings of Table 9, that the enrolment of "Middle" and "Low Income" countries have experienced the greatest declines. It should be pointed out that Concordia's visa student population has traditionally been composed of a very large percentage of students from the Third World (Magnan, Morey & Russell, 1982). International enrolment at Toronto and McGill Universities also began to show a downward trend in 1982-83.

The New Federal Immigration Act: 1976

As changes in international student enrolment took place during the early seventies, the Canadian Federal Government more seriously considered the economic implications (both national and international) of hosting these visitors. During the fifties and sixties, while Canadian universities had been developing their teaching staffs and facilities, foreign scholars had been received without major restrictions. By the 1970's however, when Canadian graduate schools had been firmly established and the demand for new doctorates had declined, the traditional laissez- faire policy concerning international students began to be questioned.

The conclusion of a 1972 federal study on citizenship of Canada's graduate school population read:

> These data make it possible . . . to discuss issues that have important implications for

> immigration policy. Should Canadian policy encourage graduate students from abroad in the numbers that are shown? . . . What proportion of Canadian graduate resources should be dedicated to the education and training of non-Canadians? Will the demand for highly qualified manpower grow to the point where it can provide full and satisfying employment for both Canadians and non-Canadian graduates? Does Canada have any responsibility for ensuring that the training it provides to students from developing countries can be utilized in that country? (Ryten, 1972, p. 7)

These questions indicated the Canadian Government's realization of the global implications for Canada of international education and its obligation to protect the training investments of developing countries from "Brain Drain" (Von Zur-Muehlen, 1978). The study also foreshadowed the Federal Government's decision, via immigration policy reform, to protect the Canadian job market and economy from the excessive influx of highly educated non-Canadian manpower.

Whereas in the past, international students had been permitted to enter Canada on temporary visas and to apply for landed immigrant status from within the country, after November 1972, applications for immigrant status could be made only from outside of Canada. From 1973, international students seeking part-time work were required to obtain permits from the Federal Manpower Office, which were issued only if it could be proven that there were no Canadian citizens qualified for the job. Exceptions were made for teaching assistantships, a few other education-related jobs and for those students in Canada under special international

training programmes (Arab, 1983, p. 7; Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1979, pp. 9-14).

In 1976, a new Immigration Act (also known as Bill C-24) was introduced in the Federal Parliament and became the most formal and comprehensive Federal Government policy to that date involving international students. This new Act, made effective in April 1978, consolidated earlier regulations for international students, requiring them to obtain Federal authorizations stating their specific purposes upon entry into Canada. Student visa applicants were also required to prove they possessed sufficient financial resources for tuition and living costs during their entire period of study in Canada. Once in the country, international students were prohibited from changing their visa status, course or institution of study, without the permission of the Federal Immigration Department. The new Immigration Act also specified that, among other things, unauthorized employment was grounds for immediate deportation (Arab, 1983).

In addition to the new federal regulations, a 1978 agreement between Québec and Ottawa stated that the Federal Immigration Commission would not issue visas to students destined for Québec, without the Province's approval. A similar arrangement was worked out between Nova Scotia and Ottawa requiring that a joint Federal-Provincial committee approve applications from international students ("Québec

and federal government sign agreement", 1978).

Government Assistance Programmes for International Students

While the Federal Government was implementing stricter immigration regulations for international students, it was also increasing study opportunities for them by means of various funding programmes. CIDA continued to provide Technical Assistance Awards in Canada to nationals of developing countries with which it had agreements. Also financed by CIDA, though administered by the International Programmes Division (IPD) of the AUCC, was the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan by which some 250 to 300 Commonwealth students were coming to Canada each year (UNESCO, 1969b, 1971b). During the seventies, the National Medical Research Council (MRC) also left most of its federally funded awards open to applicants from abroad (UNESCO, 1971b, 1976b, 1978b).

The Canada Council expanded the programme of academic exchanges with foreign countries that it administered for the Federal Department of External Affairs. By 1975, the Council distributed 175 scholarships among students from Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, France and Switzerland (UNESCO, 1971b). In return a number of awards were offered to Canadians by the governments of these countries (Paterson & Robinson, 1977).

The Province of Québec's Ministry of Intergovernmental

Affairs renewed its bursary programme with France, whereby citizens of Canada and France could obtain professional training in the other country. This Québec programme was discontinued after 1975, but was replaced soon after by a more comprehensive scheme to be discussed in the last section of this chapter.

Many of the policies and actions of the Federal Government in the late 1970's emphasized Canada's role in international relations and development. During this period, however, the largest government assistance programme for international students, the CIDA Technical Assistance Scheme, sponsored fewer than ten percent of non-national students in Canada in 1977 (Woodcock, 1973). Although the CIDA programme was continued and students under its auspices were given some employment privileges, the actual number of trainees in Canada did not significantly expand in the eighties due to CIDA's increased inclination to train recipients in their own regional institutions (Von Zur-Muehlen, 1978).

Other development oriented federal activities included enlargement of the role of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and the financing of a new International Development Office (IDO) within the AUCC. The IDRC had been operating since 1969 as a coordinator and supporter of Canadian research on development. In 1979-80, for the first time, IDRC offered direct assistance to

international students through a "Thesis Research Award", which allowed students from developing countries studying in Canada to return to their home countries to conduct their doctoral research (UNESCO, 1978b). IDRC also contributed to the founding budget of the IDO in 1978.

The IDO's mandate was to act as a facilitator and coordinator of university involvement in development projects, many of which involved international students. Furthermore, the federally funded IDO was to provide communication between Canadian universities and concerned organizations regarding international education ("AUCC establishes international development office", 1978).

The AUCC continued to administer the Canadian Commonwealth Plan for the Federal Government, providing 300 post-graduate positions until 1980-81, at which time the number of awards was decreased by one hundred. Students receiving Commonwealth and CIDA awards were exempted from differential fees in provinces where they had been imposed, except in Québec (Weston, 1983).

The award programme for foreign nationals, which the SSHRC or Canada Council administered for the Federal Department of External Affairs, was renewed from 1977 to 1983 providing mainly graduate study opportunities (150 in 1981) for eighteen countries in Central and South America, Europe and Asia (UNESCO, 1980b). The Government of Manitoba supplemented these SSHRC awards with two university

scholarships for citizens of France. Late in 1981, administrative responsibility for the "Awards for Foreign Nationals" was passed from the SSHRC to the World University Service of Canada (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, 1981).

Another significant federal contribution came from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) which had recently adopted a policy similar to that of the SSHRC in that it permitted international graduate students to receive stipends as research assistants in its projects. NSERC also offered a number of fellowships to non-national graduate students (Canadian Bureau of International Education, 1981).

During the late seventies and early eighties there were no provincial assistance programmes for international students, with the exception of the two scholarships offered by Manitoba.

Differential Fees

In 1974, a series of Federal-Provincial meetings took place to discuss revision of the Fiscal Arrangements Act, according to which all costs of post-secondary education had been shared by Ottawa and the provinces. At the conference, provincial representatives tried unsuccessfully to convince the Federal Government to assume expenses related to the education of international students. A new agreement

reached in 1976 stated that, although Ottawa would not assign more funds for international students, it would no longer earmark the monies which it issued to the provinces for the purposes of such post-secondary education. The change in the Federal-Provincial funding system, combined with the growing non-national student enrolment probably motivated some provincial governments to develop formal policies with regards to international students (Von Zur-Muehlen, 1978, p. 81).

In 1976, the Government of Ontario announced its intention to double tuition fees for non-Canadian university and college students and to increase, by a lesser amount, fees for such students enrolled before that date. Although the Ontario Government could not force universities to charge the higher fees, it did so in effect by assuming that the differential was being charged when calculating its grants. By the fall of 1977, the policy was on its way to province-wide implementation despite short-lived protests from some institutions (e.g. McMaster University).

Alberta began consideration of increased fees for international students in 1976. A two-tier fee system was in place for the 1977-78 academic year, whereby non-Canadian students were charged fifty percent more than Canadians. (Arab, 1983, p. 10; Roberts & Adam-Moodley, 1977, p. 12).

In British Columbia and Manitoba the provincial governments did not impose differential fees. In both these

provinces, however, individual universities established other enrolment restrictions for international students. At the University of British Columbia, for example, all visa students were required to have an undergraduate degree from their home country before being granted admission. Formal and informal international student quotas have also been used extensively in both of these provinces (Arab, 1983, pp. 9-10; Roberts & Adam-Moodley, 1977, pp. 14-15).

In February 1978, the Québec Government announced:

> qu'à la suite de l'Ontario et de l'Alberta . . . le gouvernement a décidé qu'il fallait absolument dans le contexte économique et budgétaire . . . hausser substantiellement les frais de scolarité des étudiants étrangers. (Québec, 1978, p. 7)

The policy was put into effect during the 1978-79 school year in an identical manner to that of Ontario, with newly registered students paying more than double the Canadian fee. Unique to Québec was the provision of some financial aid for international students already in the Province at the time of the increase. These emergency funds (fonds de dépannage) were available during the first four years following implementation of the fee policy in Québec (Bellerose, 1979).

Differential fees appeared in the Maritime universities (Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia) in 1979, following the decision of the three governments to deduct the higher international fees from provincial university grants (Canadian Bureau of International

Education, 1981, p. 21). Saskatchewan and Newfoundland have been the only Canadian provinces to date to refrain entirely from imposing formal restrictions upon international students, either in the form of higher fees or quotas (Arab, 1983, pp. 9-10; Canadian Bureau of International Education, 1981, p. 21).

Where fee or other restrictions have been placed on international students, provincial governments have, in most cases, backed their policies with three main economic arguments.

> (1) The Canadian taxpayer should not be required to subsidize the children of the wealthy in the rest of the world.
> (2) With increasing financial restraints on the tertiary educational system, Canadians should not be deprived of places in their own institutions.
> (3) There is no reason why Canada should not charge differential fees when Canadian students abroad face discriminatory tuition. (Roberts & Adam-Moodley, 1977, p. 3).

Some generally unsubstantiated arguments have also been put forward, such as the one of Manitoba's Minister of Education, that "people are entering Canada on student visas, booking into a college for a day or two, and then finding their way into the labour market" (Roberts & Adam-Moodley, 1977, p. 2). Many provinces have used Ontario's example as their reason for implementing higher fees, claiming that they could not handle large influxes of students trying to avoid Ontario's fees (Thibault, 1977, p. 18).

Based on the argument of rising education costs and the

need to match increases in the other provinces and countries, differential fees have continued to increase across Canada. In 1982, Ontario's non-Canadian students went from paying double the Canadian fee to paying about three times that amount per year. In September of 1983, international fees in Ontario almost doubled again, meaning that international students were paying more than 65% of the actual cost of their education, with a partial rebate for students enrolled before 1983. This compared to the 15% paid by Canadians. Ontario's international fee appears likely to increase significantly again in 1984-85 (Weston, 1983).

Relative to the other provinces, Alberta has kept its differential fee small ($1,090 per year more than Canadians in 1983). The British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Newfoundland Governments, to date, have not imposed any kind of differential fees. Perhaps this is because, like B.C.'s Minister of Universities, they feel that "a tiny financial gain would accrue to the universites" and that " this must be weighted against a potential educational loss to our students" (Weston, 1983, p. 6). Visa students in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick who, in the past, had been required to pay $1,000 more than Canadians, had their tuition increased again by $300 in 1983-84.

The greatest rate of increase in differential fees has been seen, however, in Québec. In 1981-82, the provisional

financial aid fund for international students was discontinued and tuition fees were doubled to $4,128 per year for incoming students. In 1982-83 the amount rose to $4,350 and it has been announced that fees will reach $5,800 per year in 1984-85. By the fall of 1984, tuition fees for visa students in Québec will be ten times the level of seven years ago ("Foreign Student fee hike now Official", 1984). The Federal Government's reaction to the provincially imposed differential fees has varied from department to department. After the fees were first imposed in Ontario and Alberta in 1977 the Federal Ministry of Manpower and Immigration reacted favourably to the initiative while CIDA strongly disapproved (Thibault, 1977, p. 19) By 1982, however, the Federal Minister of Immigration expressed the significantly different view that the policy was "self-destructive". He expressed his regret that

> It is not something we [the Federal Government] have much power to control, because fees and so on are set by provincial authorities. But I am deeply concerned about this movement and whether we should be looking at some alternative scholarship program through CIDA or others. ("Support for students," 1982)

Bilateral Education Accords in Québec

Québec, like other Canadian provinces, implemented differential fees in the late seventies and continued to raise them during the eighties. Québec has been unique in that, to date, it has been the only Province to

institutionalize certain exemptions from these higher fees.

In 1979-80, the Québec Ministries of Intergovernmental Affairs and Education signed bilateral agreements with eight countries: France, Gabon, Senegal, Ivory Coast, Zaire, Algeria, Morocco and the Central African Republic. During 1981 and 1982 similar agreements were established with Mali, Togo, Tunisia, Mauritania, Cameroun, Upper Volta, Rwanda and most recently Lebanon. These educational agreements or "accords" permitted students from the above-mentioned countries (all of them French-speaking) to attend any Québec university or CEGEP and to pay the same tuition fees as applied to Québec students. In October 1982, it was estimated that 1,625 students were studying in the Province under these agreements (Bernard, 1982a; McGill University, 1982b). The accords were bilateral in that each signing country was expected to extend reciprocal privileges to Québec students studying abroad (Québec, 1982).

There are a few other circumstances whereby international students from countries without bilateral accords could be exempted from differential fees. These included the student's enrolment in a programme specializing in the French language or involvement in academic exchanges approved by the Provincial Government (Ministère de l'Education, 1981). The establishment of these exemptions from differential fees indicated the Québec government's perception of the cultural and economic implications of

international student exchange. Educational accords were seen as direct investments in relations with the international francophone community (Ministère des affaires intergouvernementales, 1982b).

> Les réseaux de relations entre les Québécois et les diplômés étrangers du Québec devraient d'ailleurs faciliter la réalisation des objectifs d'échanges internationaux du Québec. . . .Québec devrait plûtot chercher à attirer les étudiants étrangers qu'à les repousser.(Commission d'étude sur les universités, 1979, p. 38)

Québec demonstrated a limit to its enthusiasm for this type of investment in March 1983, however, when it discontinued its fee exemption accord with Morocco (Consulat général du royaume du Maroc, 1984). The number of Moroccan students had increased at a rate much greater than any other "accord" country, approximately doubling each year since the signing of the agreement in August 1980. This almost certainly influenced Québec's decision to terminate this particular entente. At the present time Québec is said to be discussing accords with a number of other countries. As will be seen in the following chapter, the existence of bilateral agreements in Québec has made the Province an appropriate location for the specific research of this study.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to compare the socio-economic characteristics and funding sources of international students subjected to differential fees, with those of international students exempted from these fees. Data was obtained from a random sample of African students enrolled full-time in two Montréal universities during the fall of 1983. Approximately half of the students in the sample were from countries holding bilateral accords with the Province of Québec, whereby most of their nationals were exempted from differential fees at the time of the study. The remaining half of the sample was comprised of students from countries without such accords.

The means of comparison was a questionnaire designed to elicit both quantitive and qualitative information. Because this study was among the first to compare students on the basis of fee levels, emphasis was placed on the qualitative and descriptive findings.

CHOICE OF SETTING

This study was carried out during the fall of 1983 in Montréal, Québec, a location which furnished a number of conditions favourable to this particular investigation. By 1983, Québec had received many students through bilateral educational accords, which exempted almost all the nationals of sixteen countries (most of them developing, Franco-African) from differential fees at any university in the Province. At the same time, Québec hosted a sizeable number of university students from "non-accord" countries, virtually all of whom were required to pay higher tuition fees. Significant populations of exempted and non-exempted students from both francophone and anglophone backgrounds were therefore found in the city of Montréal, at both French and English language universities.

All international students in Montréal, regardless of which university they were attending and whether or not they paid differential fees, were subjected to roughly the same local costs (housing, transportation, food), prevailing at the time of the study. This common external financial factor permitted a viable comparison of the two groups regarding personal expenses and funding sources.

The two Montréal universities, selected for this study: Université de Montréal and McGill University, each have well established international reputations and long traditions of hosting international students. They also have two of the

the largest current international enrolments in the Province of Québec. Since its affiliation with Ecole Polytechnique in 1958, the Université de Montréal has included all of the Physical and Technical Sciences in its academic offerings. Thus, both universities offer equally wide ranges of academic programmes, at all levels of study. Each institution has a varied international enrolment including: French and English speaking students, students from countries with fee exemption agreements (accords), as well as those from "non-accord" countries.

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

The collection of data for the study involved the selection of a random sample of students at the Université de Montréal and McGill University from African countries having fee agreements with Québec and an approximately equal number of randomly selected African students from countries without such agreements, most of whom were required to pay higher fees in the fall of 1983. The same questionnaire (in French and English) was personally administered to each student by the researcher.

The Sample

To begin the selection of the sample a current list of African countries (Paxton, 1982) was divided into those with and without bilateral educational agreements ("accord" and

"non-accord") with the Province of Québec in 1983.

Complete listings for full-time African enrolment in the fall semester at the institutions involved were then obtained from the respective Registrars. Seven hundred and sixty-seven African students at the two institutions formed the total original population. Five hundred and forty-seven of these students came from countries with exemptive bilateral agreements with Québec in 1983. [1] Two hundred and twenty of this total student population came from countries without such agreements and were therefore automatically subjected to differential fees. When the "accord" and "non-accord" nation students were sub-divided according to the level of their countries' economic development, it was found that: 498 students in the "accord" country list came from developing countries and 49 came from those considered least developed. In the "non-accord" group, 170 students were from developing countries and 50 were from countries considered least developed.

Samples were drawn, using a table of random numbers (RAND Corporation, 1955), from each of the four population

[1] In this study, Morocco was considered as one of the thirteen "accord" countries. Although Québec cancelled its accord with this country in September 1983, all of the Moroccan students involved in this study had enrolled prior to this date and therefore were still exempted from differential fees when this research was conducted. These two groups of nations were then sub-divided according to the status of economic development, either developing or least developed, as attributed to them by the United Nations (United Nations, 1981). This allowed for representation in the study of nations at varied stages of economic development. (see Appendix A for complete derivation)

groups:

1) Developing/Accord Countries

2) Least Developed/Accord Countries

3) Developing/Non-Accord Countries

4) Least Developed/Non-Accord Countries

Sample sizes were deliberately not intended to proportionally represent their respective original populations. As seen in Table 12, samples for some cells were more representative than for others. One sample of fifty students from "accord" countries and one sample of fifty students from "non-accord" countries were produced. Both samples included in their number students from countries at varied stages of development, francophone and anglophone backgrounds and, French and English institutions.

Four replacements were necessary after the initial sample selection because of withdrawal from the university, return to home country, or adoption of immigrant status. Only one student to whom the questionnaire was delivered did not return it and could not be reached later on. The final sample consisted of 99 usable responses, 49 students from "accord" countries (most of whom were exempted from differential fees) and 50 from "non-accord" countries (most of whom were required to pay these fees).

Table 12

Fall 1983 African Student Enrolment at McGill University and University of Montreal and Samples Extracted by Level and Accord Status of Country of Origin

	Accord			Non Accord			Total	
Development Level	University	Actual Enrolment	Sample Extracted	University	Actual Enrolment	Sample Extracted	Actual Enrolment	Sample Extracted
Developing	McGill	19	10	McGill	158	22	177	32
	Montreal	479	23	Montreal	12	10	41	33
Least Developed	McGill	1	1	McGill	24	8	25	9
	Montreal	48	16	Montreal	26	10	74	26
Total		547	50		220	50	767	100

SOURCE: University of Montreal, Ecole Polytechnique and McGill University Registrar's Offices, Enrolment Statistics, Fall 1983.

Administering the Questionnaire

In order to obtain the maximum number of returns, it was decided that the researcher would personally administer the questionnaire to all participants. Using information supplied by the Registrars' Offices, brief initial contacts were made, either in person or by telephone, with the selected individuals to request their participation in the research project. If the student was willing to take part (almost all those contacted agreed to participate) and had not significantly altered his or her original visa status, an appointment was set up for delivery of the questionnaire. General information was repeated in a formal cover letter and anonymity was guaranteed to the students. Some students completed the questionnaire at the time of delivery (using an average of twenty minutes), returning it to the researcher immediately. Others chose to complete the form at their leisure over the period of a few days. These questionnaires were picked up by the researcher when ready. No personal means of identification appeared anywhere on the questionnaires.

THE INSTRUMENT

A single questionnaire was drawn up and administered to all participants in their choice of either the French or English language (see Appendix C). Both qualitative and quantitative data was elicited on the same questionnaire.

The questionnaire was examined for validity by the Registrars of the universities in the study and by four professors at McGill. A test version of the questionnaire was then administered to six international students, not eligible for the study. A number of changes to the questionnaire were subsequently made based on the responses of these students.

The questions were specifically designed to explore international students' personal and situational characteristics, including socio-economic background, sources of funding during study period and significance of fee levels in selecting a place of study.

Most of the questions appeared in multiple-choice or short answer format. One "open" question was included in order to obtain pertinent personal information and opinions not specified in the other questions.

Demographic and Academic Information

The information obtained from Questions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 12 was in most cases simply a confirmation of demographic data supplied by the university Registrars, on which basis sample selections for this study had originally been made. This included: nationality, university, level, field of study and date of enrolment. Question 5 also elicited information which by and large was already known by the Registars concerning the level of tuition fees being paid by

respondents. Any variations in tuition levels was explained through responses to Question 6.

Significance of Fee Levels

A number of questions were designed to determine the significance of fee levels in the respondents' decision to attend their specific university. Opinions on the policy of charging international students higher tuition fees were requested in Question 7. Questions 8 through 10 asked respondents whether or not they had applied and been accepted at other universities for their current programme of study. Question 11 investigated various reasons, including lower costs and applicability of scholarships, as to why respondents had finally chosen the institution currently attended.

Sources of Funding

The general question of funding sources has been broken down into a number of sub-sets. Question 13 asks respondents about their paid employment before coming to Canada and Question 25 about any major financial obligations held by them. Question 28 asks about the percentage of support received from the student's family during the study period. Restrictions on currrency exchange in the student's home country are indicated in Question 29 and efforts of the student to seek employment in Canada are covered in Question

30. Respondents were asked which awards, if any, they received for past (Question 26) or present (Question 27) periods of study. The size, duration and obligations of the bursaries were outlined in Questions 31, 32 and 33. Finally, as mentioned earlier, Question 34 was left as an open question, wherein respondents were free to make additional comments.

Socio-Ecopomic Backgrounds

Since one of the principle objectives of the study was to investigate the students' socio-economic backgrounds, many of the items on the questionnaire were directed towards this topic. The type of employment held by both respondents and their families were dealt with in Questions 14 through 17. Descriptions of the housing, properties and employees (if any) of respondents and their families in the home country were sought in Questions 18 to 23. Question 24 dealt with the cost of the respondents' accommodation here in Canada.

DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Once all of the questionnaires had been collected, the researcher went through each one individually to ensure none had been intentionally defaced or left blank. A scheme defining each possible response was constructed. With the assistance of Statistical Analysis and Data Entry personnel

at McGill University's Computing Centre, each questionnaire was coded and then entered into the computer file of the researcher.

The SPSSx Batch system (Norusis, 1983) was used to statistically analyze and, where necessary, modify data obtained from the questionnaires. A simple frequency count for all response variables was run. For some questions it was possible to group several specific responses under a general heading. For example, in investigating the occupations of students' fathers, the responses of "doctor", "lawyer", "university professor" were brought together under the new heading "professional", using the SPSSx recode facility.

Following this simplification, one-way percentage distributions were generated for a number of variables: first, for the entire population and secondly, for the exempted and non-exempted groups separately. Associations between different variables were then explored through cross-tabulations or two-way comparisons for the total and sub-divided populations. Values were extracted in the form of actual numbers of responses as well as in the form of simple percentages of respective totals. Findings were reported in these two forms. Due to the primarily exploratory and descriptive nature of this study, more complex statistical analyses of the data were not considered necessary at this time.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter analyzes the findings of the research study on international students. The objective of the analysis is to compare international students subjected to different tuition fee levels, on the basis of various personal and situational characteristics. The study selected one group of international students from countries involved in agreements with the Québec Government, whereby most nationals of these countries were permitted to attend universities in the Province at the same tuition level as applied to Canadians. The other group of selected international students, usually by virtue of their "non-accord" country of origin, were required to pay considerably higher differential fees in order to attend the same universities, usually by virtue of their non-accord country of origin. The responses of students from these two groups to thirty-four questionnaire items form the data bank of this comparative study. In this chapter, questionnaire findings are reported under four headings: population distribution; sources of funding; socio-economic characteristics; and significance of fee levels in determining the student's enrolment at the current institution.

Under the first heading, the entire study population will be described in terms of nationality and academic status, permitting the sample to be tested for general congruence against population distributions of other Canadian studies on international students.

Responses to remaining questions in this first section regarding fee levels and reasons for variations in them will further refine the original "accord/non-accord" division and lead to the identification of two even more distinct sub-groups: students actually exempted from differential fees and those students not exempted. These two newly defined groups will be employed as the study's two main comparative populations.

Under the next heading, the sources of funding used by students exempted from differential fees will be compared with those of non-exempted students. The following heading will compare the socio-economic characteristics of the two sub-groups and, where applicable, draw correlations with the students' means of funding. Under the final heading, covering the significance of fee levels in determining enrolment of a student at a particular institution, responses of exempted and non-exempted students will be weighed against one another and then re-examined for possible correlations with socio-economic and funding information.

POPULATION DISTRIBUTION

There was a wide range of African countries from which students in the sample population came. By citizenship, a total of thirty-one countries were represented, thirteen of which had educational accords with the Province of Québec at the time of the study. There was also diversity in the development levels of the countries involved, including seventeen "developing" countries and fourteen "least developed" countries (see Appendix A for complete derivation).

Students from one English-language and one French-language university were represented in the sample population. Since most countries with the above-mentioned education accords were French-speaking, it was not surprising to find the majority (77.6%) of students from these countries at the French Université de Montréal (including Ecole Polytechnique). Likewise, McGill University was the institution of the majority (60.0%) of students from "non-accord" African countries, most of them English-speaking. Despite this general trend a degree of linguistic interchange was also noted. About 40% of students from the mainly English-speaking "non-accord" countries were found at the Université de Montréal and about 22% of students from the mostly French "accord" countries were at McGill.

To express the academic distribution of the sample,

students were grouped into four levels and six fields of study (see Table 13). Students at the Master's level were seen to constitute the largest group, followed closely by the Undergraduate level, with the Doctoral and Clinical Fellow levels comprising the remainder. By field of study, Engineering held the largest percentage of sampled students, particularly at the Undergraduate level. The Sciences and Arts were the second most popular fields, followed by Education, Administrative and Law Studies and finally, Medicine.

Out of ninety-nine sampled students, only two were found in the field of Medicine as Clinical Fellows. The four Law students in the sample were enrolled in specialized International Law programmes, considered to be somewhat separate from the regular faculty operations. This finding shed some doubt on the occasional allegation that international students are depriving Canadian candidates of places in competitive professional faculties (Roberts & Adam-Moodley, 1977, p. 3).

Not only did the data collected on students' field and level of study provide an academic profile of the sample, but it also allowed for comparison of the study sample with those of larger Canadian studies on international students. A considerable degree of congruence was found between the academic population distributions found in this study and those found by Neice and Braun (1977, pp. 12-15) and Lambert

Table 13

Distribution of Total Population: Field of Study by Level of Study

	LEVEL				
Field	% Undergraduate	% Masters	% Doctoral	% Clinical Fellow	TOTAL (n)
Engineering	18.2	9.1	4.0	-	31.3 (31)
Science (including Nursing)	4.0	9.1	12.1	-	25.3 (25)
Arts	7.1	12.1	6.1	-	25.3 (25)
Education	6.1	4.0	1.0	-	11.1 (11)
Administrative, Law Studies	-	4.0	1.0	-	5.1 (5)
Medicine	-	-	-	2.0	2.0 (2)
TOTAL	35.4	38.4	24.2	2.0	100.0
(n)	(35)	(38)	(24)	(2)	

(1981, pp. 11-12), substantiating the general representativeness of the sample selected.

The bulk (66.6%) of students indicated that they had enrolled in their current programme of studies in 1982 or 1983, a time when differential fees had already been introduced. Enrolment dates were subtracted from students' projected dates of completion to obtain a tentative duration of study figure. Most (60.0%) of the sample population expected to graduate in a period of two or three years. Just over 20% anticipated a four-year period of study and the remaining 20% were scattered over shorter and longer periods.

To conclude the questions outlining the distribution of the total sample, students were asked about their fee levels and variations in them. The most common reason for exemption from differential fees reported by the students was the existence of an exemptive educational "accord" between the students' country and the Québec Government. Conversely, most students from "non-accord" countries were required to pay differential fees. There were, however, a few cases where "accord-country" nationals were not granted fee exemptions, just as there were circumstances reported by which "non-accord" nationals could be exempted from differential costs. Eight students (three from developing countries and five from least developed countries) out of the forty-nine from countries with exemptive "accords"

claimed that their fees were different from Canadians', citing their sponsorship by CIDA as the reason for this. One student out of fifty from the "non-accord" list indicated paying the same tuition as Canadians, giving "specialization in the French language" as the cause for exemption. Other cases in which "non-accord" nationals could be exempted from the higher fees in Québec included the possession of diplomatic or refugee status or involvement in other provincially recognized academic exchanges (Ministère de l'Education, 1981). No students in the sample indicated such exemptions.

The data gathered with these fee inquiries modified earlier information about the status of the international student population. It showed that there were forty-two international students in the sample who were actually exempted from differential fees and fifty-seven who were not so exempted from higher fees. At this point it became possible to re-examine distributions of the sample population in a comparative manner, in an attempt to find variations between the two newly defined exempted and non-exempted categories. Table 14 shows that, with regards to field of study, distributions for both exempted and non-exempted students were similar to those for the total population in that the three largest groups were Engineering, Science and Arts. The order of importance of these fields varied significantly however between the two

groups. Arts held the largest portion of exempted students, followed by Engineering and Science. In the non-exempt group, the greatest percentage of the total was found in Engineering, followed by Science and Arts. Education was much more frequently represented by non-exempted students than by exempted. The contrast in the Education enrolments were more than likely related to an unusually large contingent of Kenyan teachers participating in an Undergraduate level programme sponsored by their Government at McGill University at the time of the research.

Comparison of exempted and non-exempted students by level and projected duration of study also showed some diversity (see Table 15). The largest proportion of the former was found at the Undergraduate level, followed by the Master and Doctoral levels. On the other hand, non-exempted students were concentrated at the Master level, followed by Undergraduate, Doctoral and Clinical Fellow groupings respectively.

Exempted Undergraduates tended to predict periods of study shorter in duration than their non-exempted counterparts. About 29% of exempted Undergraduates forecasted a period of three years or less, compared to approximately 18% of non-exempted. Similarly, at the Doctoral level, a smaller percentage of exempted students expected a study stay of more than four years than did their non-exempted peers (8.8%). There was less contrast between

Table 14

Distribution of Exempted and Non Exempted Population by Field of Study

	Exempted Students		Non Exempted Students	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
Engineering	31.0	(13)	31.6	(18)
Science (including Nursing)	21.4	(9)	28.1	(16)
Arts	35.7	(15)	17.5	(10)
Education	4.8	(2)	15.8	(9)
Administrative, Law Studies	7.1	(3)	3.5	(2)
Medicine	-	(0)	3.5	(2)
TOTAL	100.0		100.0	

Table 15

Cross-Tabulation of Projected Number of Years of Study by Level of Study
For Exempted and Non Exempted Students

	Exempted Students Level					Non Exempted Students Level				
Years	% Under-graduate	% Masters	% Doctoral	% Clinical Fellow	TOTAL (n)	% Under-graduate	% Masters	% Doctoral	% Clinical Fellow	TOTAL (n)
1	2.4	2.4	-	-	4.8 (2)	-	3.5	-	1.8	5.3 (3)
2	9.5	14.3	-	-	23.8 (10)	10.5	21.1	3.5	-	35.1 (20)
3	16.7	14.3	9.5	-	40.5 (17)	7.0	10.5	5.3	-	22.8 (13)
4	7.1	-	9.5	-	16.7 (7)	14.0	1.8	5.3	1.8	22.8 (13)
5	4.8	-	2.4	-	7.1 (3)	-	3.5	3.5	-	7.0 (4)
6	-	2.4	2.4	-	4.8 (2)	-	-	3.5	-	3.5 (2)
7	-	-	-	-	- (0)	-	-	1.8	-	1.8 (1)
NA	-	2.4	-	-	2.4 (1)	-	-	1.8	-	1.8 (1)
TOTAL (n)	40.5 (17)	35.7 (15)	23.8 (10)	- (0)	100.0	31.6 (18)	40.4 (23)	24.6 (14)	3.5 (2)	100.0

projected periods of study at the Master's level, from which most students expected to graduate in two or three years.

SOURCES OF FUNDING

This section collected and compared information about the sources of funding and financial obligations of students, both exempted and not exempted, from differential fees. For students who received scholarship or bursary revenues, during or before the current period of study, details about the source, size and duration were gathered.

The first two tables of this section deal with the funding of international students during periods of previous post-secondary schooling. Table 16 shows that almost 90% of the total sample population had undertaken some college or university studies prior to enrolment in the current programme. Comparable percentages of students from exempted and non-exempted groups cite home country most frequently as the place of previous schooling. After their home country, exempted students reported Canada, Europe/Asia and an African country other than their home country as the next most common locations of prior study. Non-exempted respondents reported Canada and Europe/Asia with equal frequency, then another African country and finally, a very small number reported the United States.

Table 17 gives the sources of funding received by students during periods of previous post-secondary studies.

Table 16

Place of Previous Post Secondary Education for Exempted and Non Exempted Students

Previous Post Secondary Education			Place of Study					
	% (n)	% (n)	%	%	%	%	%	(n)
Student Status	Yes	No	Home Country	African not Home Country	Europe/ Asia	U.S.A.	Canada	
Exempted	90.5 (38)	9.5 (4)	57.1	7.1	11.9	-	33.3	(46)
Non-Exempted	89.5 (51)	10.5 (6)	59.6	5.3	14.0	1.8	14.0	(54)

Note. Respondents could indicate more than one place of study.

Table 17

Sources of Funding for Students Reporting
Previous Post Secondary Education

	Percentage of Total Number of Students Reporting Previous Education in each Region									
	% Home Country		% African not Home Country		% Europe/Asia		% U.S.A.		% Canada	
Student Status	Personal	Award (n)	Personal	Award (n)	Personal	Award (n)	Personal	Award (n)	Personal	Award (n)
Exempted	23.8	38.1 (26)	4.8	2.4 (3)	4.8	7.2 (5)	-	- (0)	23.8	11.9 (15)
Non-Exempted	19.3	42.1 (36)	1.8	3.6 (4)	7.0	8.8 (9)	1.8	1.8 (2)	8.8	8.9 (10)

Note. Respondents could indicate more than one source of funding in more than one region.

Exempted students (57.2%) reported funding from personal sources during periods of earlier education, more frequently than non-exempted students. Personal sources included the student's own savings or the support of family or friends. Awards in the form of scholarships, grants or bursaries were reported as funding sources by 59.6% of exempted students and 65.2% of non-exempted students. Almost 17% of the former group as opposed to 4.1% of the latter had combined both personal and award sources to support themselves during their earlier studies.

Students who had studied in their home countries were most often the recipients of academic awards which, in most cases, came from their own governments. Exempted students, a relatively large percentage (33.3%) of whom indicated previous study in Canada, had tended to support themselves from personal sources (23.8%). Students in both groups, with prior education in Europe and Asia, usually had been recipients of awards. Meanwhile, the relatively small number of students in the sample that had studied in the United States or in an African country, other than the home country, had supported themselves with a combination of personal and award funds.

On the question of funding for the current programme of studies, a substantially greater portion of exempted students (40.5%) expressed dependence on personal sources than did non-exempted students (19.3%) (see Table 18).

Table 18

Sources of Funding for Current Period of Study

Source	Exempted Students %	(n)	Non Exempted Students %	(n)
Personal	40.5	(17)	19.3	(11)
Award(s)	59.4	(25)	82.5	(47)
Total	100.0		101.8	

Note. Columns may total more than 100% because respondents could mark more than one response.

Conversely, many more (82.5% or forty-seven students) in the non-exempted group stated that they were receiving awards, than did those exempted (59.5% or twenty-five students). Just over 67% of the total number of students from developing nations relied on award revenues, while almost 83% of students from least developed countries reported receiving awards during the current study period.

Sources of awards are tabulated in Table 19 and the two subsequent tables as percentages of the total number of award recipients in each comparison group.

For both exempted and non-exempted students receiving awards for their current study period, the most frequent source was their home government. International organizations, including the United Nations, World Bank, Ford Foundation, World Health Organization, and Aga Khan Foundation were the second most frequent providers of awards to exempted students. Canadian awards were infrequent for exempted students (8.0%). Conversely, of the total number of awards received by non-exempted students Canadian sources provided 37.8%, of which 25% were from CIDA or IDRC. It is appropriate to point out here, once again, that eight students in the non-exempted category were actually from countries holding educational "accords" with Québec. Despite their country of origin these students fell into the non-exempted group because they were funded by CIDA, a Federal agency, to which Québec's "accords" have not been

Table 19

Sources of Awards Received by Students for Current Period of Study

Sources	Percentage of Total Number of Students Receiving Awards			
	Exempted Students %	(n)	Non Exempted Students %	(n)
Home Country				
Government	64.0	(17)	38.3	(21)
Non-government	4.0		6.4	
International Organization	24.0	(6)	21.3	(10)
Canada				
Government	4.0	(2)	25.0	(18)
Non-government	4.0		12.8	
Total	100.0		103.8	

Note. Respondents could indicate more than one source of awards.

extended. In some other provinces, CIDA students were granted exemptions from differential fees, as "accord" students have been in Québec. Generally speaking, however, when CIDA has decided to finance international students in Québec, it has been required to pay differential fee costs (Morey, 1984).

Five students in the sample said that they were receiving financing from the university currently attended. These were all non-exempted students from developing countries enrolled at McGill University.

By cross-tabulating data from the preceding section with funding information, it was found that the most frequent recipients of awards, both exempted and non-exempted, were enrolled in the fields of Engineering, Science and Arts. Furthermore, it was interesting to note that all nineteen non-exempted students in Education and Arts were award funded.

Awards given to students varied widely in amount, duration and attached conditions. Expenses covered by awards, for those international students who received them, are listed in Table 20. It is evident not only that non-exempted students received a greater number of awards per capita, but that their awards were larger in amount as shown by the list of expenses covered.

When questioned as to how long their awards were expected to continue, more than 12% of non-exempted award

Table 20

Expenses of Student Covered by Award

Expenses Covered	Percentage of Total Number of Award Recipients: Exempted Students %	Exempted Students (n)	Non Exempted Students %	Non Exempted Students (n)
Travel, Tuition, Accommodation, Additional Money	16.0	(4)	25.0	(12)
Travel, Tuition Accommodation	12.5	(3)	19.1	(9)
Tuition, Accommodation plus Additional Money	8.0	(2)	4.2	(2)
Travel, Tuition plus Additional Money	-	(0)	2.0	(1)
Tuition, Accommodation	8.0	(2)	14.9	(7)
Travel, Tuition	4.0	(1)	4.2	(2)
Tuition plus Additional Money	-	(0)	4.2	(2)
Accommodation plus Additional Money	4.0	(1)	6.4	(3)
Travel or Tuition or Accommodation or Additional Money	24.0	(6)	8.5	(4)
NA	24.0	(6)	10.6	(5)

recipients stated an unlimited number of years, 36.2% said three to four years and 34.0% said one to two years. On the other hand, almost half of the exempted respondents did not know how long their awards would continue. Twenty percent and 28% of the exempted group stated one to two and three to four year periods respectively. Only 40.0% reported an unlimited period.

Some awards given to international students had conditions attached to them, most commonly, the requirement of a period of work or service in their home country upon completion of their studies abroad. Table 21 shows that about the same percentage of exempted and non-exempted students who obtained award funding were bound to give service of this type. Not surprisingly, those with funding from their home governments were most frequently under such obligations together with nearly all the students funded by CIDA and IDRC. Thus, in a sense, awards reported by students in the study were often, in reality, student loans requiring a reimbursement from the student in the form of future work service.

While some international students relied entirely on award revenues, others depended to varying degrees upon personal sources for support, sometimes combining these with one award or more. Table 22 shows that exactly half of the students exempted from differential fees were meeting 50% or more of their expenses from personal sources. The remaining

Table 21

Cross-Tabulation of Obligation of Home Service by Source of Award

Award Sources	% Exempted Students					% Non Exempted Students				
	Yes	No	Don't Know	NA	(n)	Yes	No	Don't Know	NA	(n)
Home Country										
Government	40.0	12.0	-	12.0	(16)	25.5	10.6	2.1	-	(18)
Non Government	-	-	-	4.0	(1)	4.2	2.1	-	-	(3)
International Organization	20.0	4.0	-	-	(6)	12.8	8.5	-	-	(10)
Canada										
Government	-	-	-	4.0	(1)	19.1	2.1	-	4.2	(12)
Non Government	-	4.0	-	-	(1)	2.1	8.5	-	2.1	(6)
Total	60.0	20.0	-	20.0		63.7	31.8	2.1	6.3	

Note. Percentages are based on total number of students receiving awards. Respondents could indicate more than one source of funding.

Table 22

Percentage of Total Financial Support Received by Students from Personal Sources

Percentage Received	Exempted Students %	(n)	Non Exempted Students %	(n)
75-100%	40.5	(17)	19.3	(11)
50-75 %	9.5	(4)	7.0	(4)
25-50 %	-	(0)	15.8	(9)
0-25 %	42.9	(18)	54.4	(31)
NA	7.1	(3)	3.5	(2)
Total	100.0		100.0	

exempted respondents fell into the category of those receiving less than 25% of necessary revenue from such a source. Slightly over a quarter of the non-exempted population relied on personal sources for 50% or more of their expenses. The majority however, were found in the "less than 25% from personal sources" category.

Earlier findings indicated that the non-exempted group of international students received more and larger awards, and this may be one reason why they appeared to rely to a lesser extent on personal financing.

Another factor which had an impact upon the economic resources of some students during the study period was their own financial obligations, particularly responsibility for the support of friends or family members. The majority of students involved in this study did not indicate a responsibility of this type (see Table 23). This could mean either that they did not have many family responsibilities (i.e. they are single) or their family members were either financially self-sufficient or dependent on someone else.

In Table 24, which describes the efforts of international students to obtain work permits in Canada, it appears at first that non-exempted students have been more successful in this regard. The employment efforts of the two groups, however, should be seen in the context of the actual employment opportunities open to international

Table 23

Family or Friends Dependent on Students for Financial Support

Dependents	Exempted Students % Yes	% No	(n)	Non Exempted Students % Yes	% No	(n)
Family or Friends	23.8	73.8	(41)	22.8	75.4	(56)
Spouse	33.3	64.3	(41)	28.1	70.2	(56)
Children	23.8	73.8	(41)	28.1	70.2	(56)
NA	2.4	-	(1)	2.4	-	(1)

Note. Respondents could indicate more than one dependent.

Table 24

Students' Efforts to Obtain Work Permits and Employment in Canada

Application for Work Permit	Exempted Students %	Exempted Students (n)	Non Exempted Students %	Non Exempted Students (n)
Have not applied and do not intend to	50.0	(21)	52.6	(30)
Have applied or intend to	42.9	(18)	45.6	(26)
[of which obtained employment in] Canada	[21.4]	(9)	[8.8]	(5)
NA	7.1	(3)	1.8	(1)
Total	100.0		100.0	

students in Canada. By and large, positions are limited to teaching and research assistantships at the graduate level. When it is recalled that the majority of exempted students in the sample were Undergraduates and therefore ineligible for these positions, it became evident that proportionally more exempted students able to seek work, did so. This coincided with the earlier findings of exempted students' greater reliance on personal sources of funding.

To conclude this section on sources of funding, international students were asked about restrictions on foreign exchange imposed by their own governments. This was an important consideration for international students using both personal and award funding, except for those receiving all their revenues from Canadian sources or certain international organizations. Responses revealed that the governments of exempted (54.8%) and non-exempted students (66.7%) usually have control over the flow of currency outside the country to some extent. A minority in both groups stated that there were no restrictions on currency exchange. Another significant observation regarding this question was that many students, exempted (35.7%) as well as those not non-exempted (19.3%), were totally uninformed on the topic of foreign exchange controls. This probably signified that they personally have had few experiences in seeking the transfer of funds from abroad or that they had none to transfer. These students were probably those whose

financial affairs were conducted for them, by a family member or funding organization.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

A number of questionnaire items obtained information for use in the comparison of the socio-economic characteristics of exempted and non-exempted students. This included data on the occupations and the living standards of the students and their families, both in the home country, as well as in Canada.

Before comparing the two groups, the questionnaire items in this section were tested for their general reliability as indicators of socio-economic level by examining the consistency of replies regarding father's occupation, number of domestics, and number of separate bedrooms in the home country dwelling. Similar distributions in responses to these and other questions, indicated their soundness as gauges of socio-economic level.

Socio-economic comparisons began with the student's experience on the work force (see Table 25). A considerable difference was seen between exempted and non-exempted individuals. Responses showed that about 57% of the former group had held full or part-time employment during this period, as opposed to 70.2% of the latter. In both comparison groups, the majority of those with job histories had been government employees. Only one exempted student

Table 25

Students' Occupation Before Coming to Canada

Occupation	Exempted Students %	(n)	Non Exempted Students %	(n)
Professional	28.6	(12)	59.6	(34)
Owner	-	(0)	1.8	(1)
Administrator/ Manager	11.9	(5)	10.5	(6)
Skilled Trade	-	(0)	1.8	(1)
NA	59.5	(25)	26.3	(15)
Total	100.0		100.0	

had held a non-government position. A few non-exempted students had had non-government positions and one had been self-employed, before coming abroad. The usefulness of comparison of students' employment histories was limited due to a rather high no response rate, particularly among exempted students. This may have been related to the fact that most students were involved in full-time studies before coming to Canada, as was found in the data collected earlier in the questionnaire.

Table 26 shows that of the total number of students' fathers, 65.7% were (or had been for most of their careers) in higher status employment positions including professionals, owners, administrator/managers. This percentage corresponded exactly with the findings of Neice and Braun (1977, p. 37) in their international student survey. While about the same proportion of fathers of exempted and non-exempted students were professionals and administrator/managers, considerably more owner fathers were found in the non-exempted category. In the lower status occupations, skilled , unskilled trades and service jobs, the distribution of exempted and non-exempted students was similar. It is important to note that a significant percentage (19.0%) of exempted students did not respond to this question. Cross-tabulation with other socio-economic indicators further on, however, revealed that most of those who did not respond to this question were of lower

Table 26

Occupations of Students' Family Members

	Father				Mother				Spouse			
	Exempted		Non Exempted		Exempted		Non Exempted		Exempted		Non Exempted	
ccupations	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
rofessional	26.2	(11)	21.1	(12)	7.1	(3)	12.3	(7)	7.1	(3)	17.5	(10)
wner	11.9	(5)	29.8	(17)	16.7	(7)	21.1	(12)	-	(0)	-	(0)
dmin/Man	23.8	(10)	17.5	(10)	2.4	(1)	1.8	(1)	7.1	(3)	7.0	(4)
killed Trade	4.8	(2)	5.3	(3)	2.4	(1)	5.3	(3)	2.4	(1)	5.3	(3)
ervice	2.4	(1)	7.0	(4)	-	(0)	-	(0)	-	(0)	-	(0)
emi/Unskilled rade	11.9	(5)	12.3	(7)	2.4	(1)	5.3	(3)	-	(0)	1.8	(1)
Housewife"	-	(0)	-	(0)	31.0	(13)	28.1	(16)	-	(0)	1.8	(3)
niversity tudent	-	(0)	-	(0)	2.4	(1)	-	(0)	9.5	(4)	1.8	(1)
A	19.0	(8)	7.0	(4)	35.7	(15)	26.3	(15)	73.8	(31)	61.4	(35)
otal	100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0	

socio-economic status. Taking this into consideration, it appeared that more fathers of exempted than non-exempted students held lower status jobs.

Based on the responses gathered it was found that at least 42.9% of the fathers of exempted students were government employees, 11.9% were non-government workers and 23.8% were self-employed. For non-exempted students, fathers were reported as follows: government employees (38.6%), non-governmental employees (10.5%) and self-employed (42.1%).

Data on mothers' occupations, also reported in Table 26, seemed to repeat this pattern. While 23.8% of mothers of non-exempted respondents were said to be professionals or owners, 33.4% of exempted students had mothers in similar positions. Mothers in the non-exempted group slightly outnumbered exempted in the lower status jobs, including that of dressmaker and vendor.

Most working mothers fell into the self-employed category (21.4% exempted and 26.3% non-exempted), usually as operators of small businesses or farms. The government employed 9.5% and 8.8% of exempted and non-exempted students' mothers respectively.

"Housewife" was frequently stated as the mother's vocation by students from both groups. It was felt, however, that this title was not particularly useful as an indicator of socio-economic level, since the "housewife"

category could include both women with enough financial security to remain home by choice, as well as those who were obliged to stay home for family reasons.

Also in Table 26, more exempted students (17.%) indicated employment of spouses and tended to report a higher status for their employment. The findings of the question regarding spouses' work had limited application because such a large percentage of students did not respond. In most cases, this was probably because they are single. One interesting finding was the number of husbands and wives of exempted students (9.5%) enrolled in University programmes. It is likely that these spouses were also taking advantage of exemptions from differential fees extended through their countries' educational accords with Québec.

Table 27 gives a cross-tabulation of structure by ownership status of the dwelling where students lived for most of the five years before coming to Canada. About half of the total number of exempted students reported that they had lived in dwellings (usually private homes) owned or rented by their families. A substantial number (35.7%) said that they had lived in apartments that they themselves had rented. By contrast, only 15.8% of non-exempted students had rented their own apartments, while most (59.6%) had lived in a rented or owned family dwelling.

Responses to two items on the questionnaire were

Table 27

Cross-Tabulation of Structure by Ownership Status
of Student's Dwelling in Home Country

	Exempted Students					Non Exempted Students				
	Student Owned % (n)	Family Owned % (n)	Student Rented % (n)	Family Rented % (n)	Subsidized Housing % (n)	Student Owned % (n)	Family Owned % (n)	Student Rented % (n)	Family Rented % (n)	Subsidized Housing % (n)
Private House	4.8(2)	23.8(10)	11.9(5)	2.4(1)	2.4(1)	1.8(1)	43.9(25)	12.3(7)	5.3(3)	7.0(4)
Row House	2.4(1)	9.5(4)	7.1(3)	- -	2.4(1)	1.8(1)	- -	- -	- -	7.0(4)
Apartment	- -	9.5(4)	14.3(6)	- -	- -	1.8(1)	1.8(1)	1.8(1)	1.8(1)	5.3(3)
Commercial Building	- -	2.4(1)	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	1.8(1)	7.0(4)	- -
University Building	- -	- -	- -	- -	2.4(1)	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
NA	- -	- -	2.4(1)	2.4(1)	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Total	7.1	45.2	35.7	4.8	7.1	5.3	45.6	15.8	14.0	19.3

combined in Table 28 to produce a "number of persons per bedroom" ratio, in other words, an indicator of the degree of crowding in the dwelling described above. On the whole (76.8% of the total population), both exempted and non-exempted students lived quite spaciously in their home country, with less than two persons per room, a slightly greater percentage of exempted students lived in more spacious homes.

Additional details concerning the students' standard of living in the home country included the number of domestics usually employed by them or their families and the possession of properties other than the main dwelling.

As Table 29 reports, many more (78.9%) non-exempted students indicated that they or their families usually employed one or more domestics, than did students from the exempted group (54.7%). It was noteworthy, however, that in the "five or more domestics" category, there were more exempted than non-exempted students (19.0% versus 7.0%). This dichotomy within the exempted population repeated the pattern found in many tables in this section, with a minority of students from the exempted group concentrated in the uppermost socio-economic categories and the remainder concentrated in the lowermost levels.

The vast majority (71.6%) of students, in the sample, both exempted and non-exempted, reported that they or their families owned some properties in addition to their main

Table 28

Number of Persons per Separate Bedroom
Usually Living in this Dwelling

Persons Per Separate Bedroom	Exempted Students %	Exempted Students (n)	Non Exempted Students %	Non Exempted Students (n)
Less than .9 persons	19.1	(8)	7.1	(4)
.9 - 1.8 persons	54.7	(23)	72.0	(41)
1.8 - 2.7 persons	7.1	(3)	3.5	(2)
2.7 - 3.6 persons	19.0	(8)	10.5	(6)
3.6 - 4.5 persons	-	(0)	7.0	(4)
Total	100.0		100.0	

Table 29

Number of Domestics Usually Employed by Student and/or Family in Home Country

Number of Domestics	Exempted Students %	Exempted Students (n)	Non Exempted Students %	Non Exempted Students (n)
5 or More	19.0	(8)	7.0	(4)
3 - 4	2.4	(1)	10.5	(6)
1 - 2	33.3	(14)	61.4	(35)
None	35.7	(15)	21.1	(12)
NA	9.5	(4)	-	(0)
Total	100.0		100.0	

dwelling. Possibly due to a weakness in the questionnaire instrument, students often gave imprecise property descriptions for this variable and therefore it was difficult to compare the information gathered. A slightly larger percentage of non-exempted students (26.3%) reported that their families had no additional property of this kind, than did those students in the exempted category.

In Table 30, the amount paid by students for accommodation in Canada is shown. A far greater percentage (35.7%) of exempted students were found in the highest rent bracket of more than $300. per month compared to just 8.8% of non-exempted students. In the lowest priced accommodation category ($100. to $200. per month) 23.8% of exempted students and 42.1% of non-exempted appeared. Also in Table 30, these rent distributions, are combined with previous information about students whose accommodation in Canada was covered by an award they were receiving. The largest portion of exempted (46.7%) and non-exempted (47.2%) students who received awards, which covered accommodation, lived in middle-priced housing ($201. to $300. per month) in Montréal. The remaining exempted students whose rent was covered by an award, tended to occupy the most costly housing in the city, while the remainder of the non-exempted group inhabited the cheapest lodgings.

In this section and the preceding two of the study

Table 30

Cost of Student's Accommodation per Month in Canada

Rent per Month	Exempted Students: Award Covers Accommodation? % Yes	% No	(n)	Non Exempted Students: Award Covers Accommodation? % Yes	% No	(n)
More than $300	14.3	19.4	(15)	3.5	5.3	(5)
$201-300	16.7	23.8	(17)	29.8	19.8	(28)
$100-200	4.8	19.0	(10)	29.8	12.3	(24)

two, the distribution of the sample population have been reported separately for national and academic status, funding sources and socio-economic indicators. To obtain a more complete picture of the sampled exempted and non-exempted populations, correlations between selected indicators from these separate categories are explored at this point in the presentation of findings.

Table 31 shows the distributions resulting from a cross-tabulation of the development level of the students' countries and the occupations of their fathers. Occupations were simplified by grouping professionals, owners and administrator/managers, under the heading of "higher status". Skilled, semi and unskilled trades, as well as service jobs have been brought together under the term "lower status".

Just over half (53.3%) of the exempted students from developing countries reported having fathers in higher status occupations, while 23.3% reported lower status positions. It was also found, by referring to responses to other items, that the 23.3% of exempted students from developing countries, who did not report fathers' occupation, came from lower socio-economic levels. This signified that almost half (46.6%) of students in this category were from the lower socio-economic bracket. Of the students from the least developed nations, 83.3% said that their fathers were in the higher status job categories

Table 31

Cross-Tabulation of National Development Level by Status of Father's Occupation

Father's Occupation Status	Exempted Students % Developing Countries	% Least Developed Countries	(n)	Non Exempted Students % Developing Countries	% Least Developed Countries	(n)
Higher Status	53.3	83.3	(26)	70.6	65.2	(39)
Lower Status	23.3	8.3	(8)	20.6	30.4	(14)
NA	23.3	8.3	(8)	8.8	4.3	(4)
Total	100.0 (30)	100.0 (12)		100.0 (34)	100.0 (23)	

and 8.3% were in the lower.

The fathers of non-exempted students from developing countries more often (70.6%) had higher status occupations, than lower (29.4%). This included three non-respondents which, according to their other responses, came from lower socio-economic backgrounds. For least developed countries, non-exempted students' fathers were similarly distributed, with 69.5% (including one reclassified non-response) in higher status employment and 30.4% in lower status positions. Among the possible reasons for differences in socio-economic status between exempted and non-exempted students from both developing and least developed nations in the sample, was the distribution of award funding.

Table 32 shows the occupation status groups for fathers of students receiving awards. Non-responses were appropriately re-classified based on information collected for other questions. Figures are calculated as percentages of the total number of students who received awards in the exempted and non-exempted categories. It should be recalled that a larger portion of the overall non-exempted population (82.5%) received awards, than did the exempted (59.5%).

By combining data in Tables 31 and 32, it was found that an approximately equal percentage (71%) of the total number of students in the sample with higher and lower positioned fathers received awards of some type during their period of study. When a comparison was made between

Table 32

Cross-Tabulation of Award Recipients by Status of Father's Occupation

Father's Occupation Status	Percentage of Total Number of Award Recipients			
	Exempted Students		Non Exempted Students	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
Higher Status	56.0	(14)	46.0	(31)
Lower Status	24.0	(6)	25.5	(12)
NA	20.0	(5)	8.5	(4)
Total	100.0		100.0	

exempted and non-exempted students it was found that somewhat more, about 40%, of award funded exempted students had fathers in lower status positions, than did non-exempted students (31.9%).

SIGNIFICANCE OF FEE LEVELS

This final section presents responses to questionnaire items dealing directly and indirectly with the significance of fee levels in determining students' enrolment at the current institution in Canada.

Table 33 compares items selected by exempted and non-exempted students from a list of reasons for choice of their current universities. The first item on the list, "low costs", was indicated by 9.5% of exempted students and by 1.8% of the non-exempted. These totals seemed suprisingly low, particularly for those students who were exempted from differential fees, in view of previous information on their funding sources and socio-economic backgrounds.

Infrequent mention of the cost factor was also found in the Neice and Braun survey of 1977 (p. 51). The authors of that study noted that students often expressed financial concerns indirectly in other responses. In this study as well, students gave other reasons for their choice which implied cost considerations. Almost all (30%) of the non-exempted students, who received more awards per capita,

Table 33

Reasons Given by Students for Choice of Current Institution

Reason for Choice	Exempted Students %	Exempted Students (n)	Non Exempted Students %	Non Exempted Students (n)
Low Costs	9.5	(4)	1.8	(1)
Scholarship Applied	7.1	(3)	29.8	(17)
Employment Possible	-	(0)	1.8	(1)
Relatives Closeby	4.8	(2)	8.8	(5)
Accepted	23.8	(10)	22.8	(13)
Programme of Studies	26.2	(11)	26.3	(15)
Reputation or Recommendation of University	40.5	(17)	45.6	(26)
Other Personal or Academic Reasons	12.0	(5)	3.6	(2)

Note. Respondents could indicate more than one reason.

gave applicability of their scholarship as a main reason for their selection of the current institution.

Other reasons for choice shown in Table 33 were academically oriented. The largest percentage of exempted and non-exempted populations focused on the reputation or programme of studies of the institution.

Table 34 report the frequency of applications for the current period of study to home country universities, which usually have relatively low tuition and, that of application to foreign universities, which often require non-nationals to pay a differential fee.

Although 26.3% of non-exempted students reported that they had applied to a university in their home country, findings showed that only 10.5% were offered a place there. Of students exempted from fees, 11.9% made applications to home institutions and 9.5% were offered places.

More exempted students (21.4%) said that they had applied to schools in African countries other than their own, than did non-exempted (15.8%). On the other hand, non-exempted students reported that they had applied more frequently to universities in Britain (14.0%), the United States (22.8%) and elsewhere in Québec (3.5%). The fact that many non-exempted students were from Commonwealth countries, with historical ties with Britain, probably led to their more frequent application to that country. Students with fee exemptions were shown to have applied less

Table 34

Applications to Other Universities for Current Period of Study

Location of University	Exempted Students %	Exempted Students (n)	Non Exempted Students %	Non Exempted Students (n)
Home Country	11.9	(5)	26.3	(15)
African Country Other Than Home Country	21.4	(9)	15.8	(9)
Britain	2.4	(1)	14.0	(8)
U.S.A.	14.3	(6)	22.8	(13)
Québec	-	(0)	3.5	(2)

Note. Respondents could indicate more than one university.

often to institutions outside of Africa. Only 2.4% exempted students had applied to Britain and 14.3% to the U.S.

To complement data regarding the significance of fee levels, respondents gave their general opinion on the policy of charging international students higher tuition than Canadians. The majority of students, whether they were from the exempted (54.8%) or non-exempted group (59.6%), declared the fee policy unfair. A small percentage in both groups, 7.1% of exempted and 8.8% of non-exempted, felt that the policy is fair, occasionally citing similar procedures in their home country. Approximately one third of both groups chose the "no comment" option as their response to this particular question, possibly for reasons of diplomacy.

To conclude the questionnaire, students were asked for additional comments about their study experience in Canada or on the general topic of fees for international students. The extent to which students commented in this optional question reflected their deep concern about the direction of fee policies in Canada and their willingness to cooperate with research efforts on this topic. Out of ninety-nine students in the sample, fifty-nine made additional comments, forty-four of them replying at length. A sampling of some of the particularly characteristic comments will follow.

The nature and tone of comments were remarkably similar for exempted and non-exempted students, taking either the form of policy criticism or expression of personal

difficulties encountered in financing education in Canada. International students not only found the differential fee to be, "discriminatory" and "excessive", but also found the policy to be in contradiction with Canada's professed willingness to cooperate and assist in the development of Third World countries. Other comments dealt with the difficulties of home governments to meet the high costs of educating much needed trained manpower and the reliance of developing countries upon access to academic programmes and facilities not available in the Third World.

As one non-exempted student said:

> The international students tuition fees should be reduced so that more countries (especially the Third World countries) can afford to educate their people. If it were not for my Government, which is straining to maintain me here, I would not be in McGill because my parents cannot afford (sic).

A student from a least developed country with a fee exemption pointed out, "nous venons étudier ici parce qu'il n'y a pas le programme convoité à notre université du pays".

Many Moroccan students mentioned the discontinuation of Québec's exemptive accord with their country, saying that this would close the opportunity of study in Canada to all but the very rich students. One student from an accord country came to Québec specifically to take advantage of exemption privileges still extended to his country by the Province.

> Je paye les mêmes frais de scolarité qu'un canadien, parce que mon pays a un accord académique avec la province de Québec; et c'est

> surtout pour cela, que j'ai tenu à venir finir mes études dans cette province. Mais avant . . . j'étais à l'université d'Ottawa, et je payais très très cher pour mes frais.

It is suggested by a non-exempted student that exemptions might be made available to

> étudiants réssortrissants de pays pauvres pour payer des frais de scolarité comme les canadiens, même si leur pays a "oublié" de signer officiellement une entente . . . avec Québec.

Exempted and non-exempted students alike commented on their personal financial difficulties.

> It is rather onerous for a private student from a poor developing country to study in Canada because of the fee policy and the extreme employment restrictions. The universities . . . are extremely reluctant (even unwilling) to give aid to financially hard up foreign students.

Finally, as was shown in the following account, not only "private" students experienced the personal burden of increased fees:

> In the early months of 1981, a team of Kenya Government officials did a survey on some Canadian universities to which it intended to send students that year. It found that McGill University had a reasonable tuition fee. Seventy places are obtained for students at McGill . . . $10,000. per student per year was assigned . . . . BUT when the students arrived in September 1981 . . . we found the fee was up by more than two times . . . . The money assigned per student would not be increased, therefore the money agreed on for accommodation had to be reduced to make up for the fee increment.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study, two groups of African students randomly selected from the fall 1983 enrolments of two Montreéal universities, were identified as being exempted and non-exempted from differential tuition fees. These two groups were compared on the basis of their socio-economic backgrounds, funding sources and other related characteristics. The statistical facilities of the SPSSx Batch system were used to carry out one-way percentage distributions and cross-tabulations of the data collected.

This, the concluding chapter of the thesis first will summarize the findings and data analysis presented in the preceding chapter. A brief discussion of possible implications of the findings will follow. Finally, a few suggestions for future research on international students will be presented, based upon not only the results of this study, but also the historical survey and review of literature on the topic.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

National and Academic Distribution

The first section of questionnaire items dealt with the national composition and distribution of the study population, under several academic categories. The sample was made up of approximately equal numbers of students from countries with and without bilateral educational accords with Québec, including about twice as many students from developing as from least developed nations. As was intended in the sample selection, student representation from French language and English language institutions were more or less equal. For the population chosen, the fields of Engineering, Science and Arts at the graduate levels were found to be the most densely populated. This distribution indicated that the sample chosen for this study was roughly comparable to other international student populations in Canada.

The classification of the sample population by actual fee level, demonstrated that although most students from accord countries were exempted from differential fees and that most non-accord nationals paid the higher fees, the reverse was occasionally true. The sample population was ultimately found to contain forty-two students exempted from the higher fees and fifty-seven who were not exempted.

Comparative distributions of exempted and non-exempted

students revealed some differences in their fields and levels of study. A further cross-tabulation found that, with the exception of the Master's level, exempted students tended to predict a shorter period of study than did non-exempted students. Possible reasons for this variation became apparent in the data regarding the students' sources of funding.

Funding Sources

Inquiries as to the funding sources of international students revealed that a larger percentage of non-exempted respondents depended on award revenues during their studies in Canada. Generally speaking, the awards received by the non-exempted students were also larger in amount and duration, suggesting a possible reason why non-exempted students predicted longer study periods. In both comparison groups the greatest part of awards went to students from least developed countries and, especially those enrolled in Engineering, Science and Arts programmes. The most frequent source of awards were the home governments of both exempted and non-exempted students. These awards often obliged students to complete a work service period at home after completing their studies abroad. Awards from Canadian sources, particularly those from CIDA and IDRC, furnished a significant number of non-exempted students with funding, usually requiring a similar post-study work commitment in

the student's home country.

Reliance upon personal (self or family) funding was more pronounced among exempted students, almost half of whom obtained 75% or more of their financial requirements from this source. The remainder of exempted students received minor amounts from personal sources; most of these were also award recepients. The majority of non-exempted students met a small proportion of their financial requirements with funds from personal sources, although a few students in this group relied entirely or almost entirely on this type of support. The data obtained concerning the socio-economic characteristics of the two populations provided further understanding of these funding patterns.

Socio-Economic Backgrounds

It was found that the majority of students (both exempted and non-exempted) came from the higher echelons of their societies. However, there also appeared to be a sizeable minority of students in the sample from lower societal positions.

The students' socio-economic status was estimated by comparing and combining their responses to questions regarding they and their families' occupations and standard of living. It was found that most students required to pay differential fees came from the higher socio-economic brackets of their communities. These non-exempted students,

their fathers, mothers and spouses tended to work as professionals, owners or administrators/managers. They lived spaciously in private homes, usually employing at least one domestic and frequently more.

On the whole, the exempted students in the sample were less affluent. Their family members more often held jobs in the skilled, semi or unskilled trades. Their families more often owned dwellings in buildings shared by other occupants, such as, apartment buildings or row houses. These students frequently declared that their families employed no domestics at all. There was, however, a small number within the exempted group which tended to be concentrated in the privileged categories of indicators, equalling or surpassing the average socio-economic status of students who were required to pay differential fees. Thus, a socio-economic polarization presented itself within the exempted population. These few privileged exempted students often equalled or surpassed the average status of students required to pay differential fees.

One interesting variation was found regarding the living arrangements and work histories of students in their home countries. Non-exempted more often than exempted students stated having held higher status full or part-time employment in their home countries prior to coming to Canada. Somewhat surprising therefore was the finding that more exempted students reported either having owned or

rented their own dwelling in the home country, than did non-exempted respondents, who usually lived in their parents' home before coming abroad. This may indicate that there was a a greater need on the part of non-exempted students to build up personal savings before embarking on their studies abroad.

With reference to the cost of lodging in Canada, the responses varied widely depending on the sources of funding available to the student. Most personally supported exempted students lived in cheaper housing in Canada, than did personally supported non-exempted students. Exempted students receiving awards covering accommodation, tended to live in middle priced housing. On the other hand, award funded non-exempted students were found in the lowest priced lodgings. This seemed to indicate that when students' awards had to be stretched to cover differential fees, very little remained for accommodation and other basic expenses.

For the population as a whole, awards were more or less equally distributed to students from higher and lower socio-economic backgrounds. However, when the two comparison groups were examined separately, it was found that more non-exempted students receiving awards came from privileged social positions.

If awards were sometimes disproportionately distributed among socio-economic levels, imbalances also appeared in representation of different socio-economic levels depending

on the development level of the country of origin. Of the non-exempted students in the sample from both developing and least developed countries approximately three-quarters were of higher socio-economic status and about one quarter of lower status.

The fact that many more students of all socio-economic groups in the non-exempted population received award funding may have opened the opportunity of study abroad to more students of poorer backgrounds in that group. In the exempted category, representation of lower and higher socio-economic positions was almost equal for those from developing countries. A large discrepancy presented itself however for in the case of exempted students from the least developed countries, in which about 90% came from the upper echelons and less than 10% came from the lower.

Significance of Fee Levels

Responses to the final series of questions indicated that costs (of all types) were significant for most students in their choice of institution. Non-exempted students, who were more often funded, tended to mention awards (which usually paid their tuition fees) as the main reason for their selection of institution. This may suggest that many students required to pay differential fees, who could not obtain study awards, were not financially able to come to a Canadian university. More non-exempted students than

exempted had applied for the current period of study to countries where differential fees were in effect. On the other hand, exempted students seldom applied to countries where differential fees were being charged.

More non-exempted students had also applied for often limited places in home country universities and almost half of them had been denied entrance to these national institutions. It seems likely that these non-exempted students would have had difficulty in continuing their advanced studies, if they had not been able to study in Canada or another foreign country. Exempted students in the sample seldom reported having applied to countries where differential fees were being charged.

The majority of students viewed the differential fee policy as unfair. The policy was criticized from the standpoint of harm to Canada's international relations and the Third World's need for assistance from the developed world. Several individuals whose countries had signed exemptive accords with the Province of Québec said that they were not capable of paying differential fees charged in other provinces. Non-exempted students also revealed the significance of fees by remarking that it was only because their tuition was covered by awards, that they were able to study in Canada.

Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research

The findings of this study contribute to a much needed, more complete, qualitative description of the international student body in Canada. With reference to the total student population sampled in this study the following observations have arisen. First, it can be said that most of the international students came from the higher socio-economic levels of their communities. Second, the majority received some form of award funding during their period of study in Canada. Third, financial considerations, including fee levels, were a significant factor in the student's selection of a particular institution.

Although further characteristics of the total population could be extracted from the data, most relevant to this study were the observations which compared the exempted and non-exempted sub-populations on the basis of socio-economic characteristics, funding sources and other related factors.

This comparison allowed for a scientifically documented investigation of a view, which has been expressed frequently by concerned advocates of international education: namely, that there is a relationship between variations in fee levels and changes in the composition of international student enrolments in Canada.

Based on the analysis of a real sample, this study did find associations between fee levels and the characteristics

of international students. On the whole, students in the sample who paid differential fees were found to be from higher socio-economic levels than those students who were exempted from the differential fees. Furthermore, students in the sample who were required to pay higher fees were more frequently recipients of awards (generally larger in value), than were students who were not required to pay the higher fees.

Of course, there were students from the exempted group from higher social strata, as well as those who received study awards but, generally speaking, these were in the minority. Similarly, the proportion of non-exempted students from lower socio-economic brackets, without funding, was found to be very small.

These variations suggest that fewer students without awards or from lower socio-economic backgrounds were able to finance study in Canada when faced with differential fees. Therefore, it might be said that differential fees had created significant financial barriers for non-funded or less wealthy students.

Although the study sample was limited to African students in the Province of Québec, it seems likely that similar correlations between fee levels and population composition would apply for international students from other developing regions, in other parts of Canada as well. In other provinces, where differential fees have been

charged, opportunities for fee exemptions have been less numerous than in Québec. In these places, therefore, international student populations likely will be more severely altered by differential fees, in favour of award-funded or more privileged students.

This correlation is something which policymakers, at all levels of government, may wish to consider in the formation or modification of policies and programmes related to international students in Canada, particularly in development assistance schemes for the Third World. Non-governmental educational organizations and universities also may wish to keep these findings in mind when developing award facilities, academic exchanges and selection procedures for non-Canadian students.

With regard to research in the field, this study should be seen as a contribution to a more comprehensive, qualitative picture of international students subjected to different tuition levels throughout Canada. It is hoped that larger studies of this type in the future will contribute further to the understanding of this policy's implications. Other possible approaches for future research might include a study of shifts in international enrolment between Canadian provinces with and without differential fees, or a survey of foreign nationals who applied and were accepted at Canadian universities, but did not come.

In any such future research, the combination of

information on the students' socio-economic levels and their sources of funding is felt to be extremely important in providing a more complete picture of the populations facing higher tuitions. Towards this end it is suggested that universities and governments departments seek more detailed information of this type from non-Canadian students at registration or upon entry to Canada. Judging from the willingness of participants in this study, it is presumed that such data could be easily obtained.

REFERENCES

American Council on Education. Foreign students and institutional policy. Washington: American Council on Education, 1982.

Arab, S. International students: Policy and practices. Ottawa: Canadian Federation of Students, 1983.

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Citizenship of students and faculty in Canadian univerities: A statistical report. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1979.

AUCC establishes international development office. University Affairs, April 1978, p. 17.

Ballantyne, M. International students. Paper presented at the tenth annual meeting of the Association of Student Councils, Regina, Saskatchewan, October, 1979.

Bartlett, D. W. Foreign students under official auspices. Proceedings of the Thirteenth Meeting of the National Conference of Canadian Universities, 1954, 38-41.

Bellerose, H. More than one million. MEQnews, June/July 1979.

Bernard, Y. Pays signataires d'une entente de réciprocité avec le Québec en matière de droits de scolarité. Québec: Ministère des Affaires Intergouvernementales, 1982. (a) (mimeograph)

Bernard, Y. Recommandation et projet de décret relatif à l'entente avec la République du Rwanda: Annex 1. Québec: Ministère des affaires intergouvernementales, 1982.(b)(mimeograph)

Blizzard, F. H. West Indians in Canada. Guelph: Univeristy of Guelph, 1970.

Canadian Bureau of International Education. Statistics on foreign students, 1981-82, 1982-83. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau of International Education, 1983.

Canadian Bureau of International Education. A question of self-interest. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau of International Education, 1977.

Cieslak, E. C. The foreign students in American colleges. Detroit: Wayne University, 1955.

Clarke, D.B. Review of the present situation. Proceedings of the Thirteenth Meeting of the National Conference of Canadian Universities, 1954, 33-37.

Commission d'étude sur les universités. Comité d'étude sur l'organisation du système universitaire (Pt. 1) Québec: editeur officiel, 1979.

Cômmission on Foreign Student Policy. The right mix: The report of the commission on foreign student policy in Canada. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau of International Education, 1981.

Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility. Educational interchange: A commonwealth imperative. London: Commonwealth Secretariat, 1982.

Consulat Général du Royaume du Maroc. Personal communication, March 31, 1984.

Côté, M. L'évaluation comparative des admission d'étudiants étrangers dans les universités francophone. Unpublished masters thesis, Université de Montréal, 1979.

Cormack, M.L. International development through international exchange. Review of Educational Research, 1968, 38(1), 293-302.

Cormack, M.L. An evaluation of research on educational exchange. Prepared for the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, U.S. Department of State. Washington, D.C. : U.S. Department of State, 1962.

Davis, J.M., Hanson, R.G., & Burnor, D.R. IIE survey of the African student: His achievements and his problems. New York: Institute of International Education, 1961.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Educational Division. Survey of higher education 1969-70 (Pt.1). Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970. (a)

Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Educational Division. Survey of higher education 1962-63, 1964-65, 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68, 1968-69. (Pt.2). Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1966-1970. (b)

Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Educational Division. Survey of higher education , 1946-48, 1948-50, 1954-61, 1961-62. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1950-1964. (a)

Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Educational Division. University student expenditure and income in Canada (Pt.1). Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1963. (b)

Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Education Statistics Branch. Higher education in Canada, 1938-40. Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier, 1941.

Farlardeau, J.C. Scholarships for foreign students. Proceedings of the Thirteenth Meeting of the National Conference of Canadian universities 1954, 42-46.

Foreign student fee hike now official. McGill Reporter, March 1982, p. 2.

Garneau, J. Foreign students in Canadian universities: 1965-66 - 1970-71. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1966-71.

Genest. S. Les étudiants africains au Canada. Québec: Département d'Anthropologie, Université Laval, 1972. (mimeograph)

Goodwin. C.D., & Nacht, M. Absence of decision. New York: Institute of International Education, 1983.

Groberman, R. Personal communication, June 23, 1982.

Hettich, W. Foreign student costs: A report on the costs of educating foreign students at Canadian universities. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau of International Education, 1977.

Hodder, H.J. Canadian aid to developing countries. In J.E. Hodgetts (Ed.), Higher education in a changing Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1966.

Klineberg, O. International educational exchange. New York: Praeger, 1976.

Klineberg, O. Psychological aspects of student exchange. In I. Eide (Ed.), Students as Links between Cultures. Oslo: UNESCO, 1970.

Klineberg, O., & Hull, W.F. At a foreign university: An international study of adaptation and coping. New York: Praeger, 1979.

Lande, G. Canadian aid to French developing countries. In J.E. Hodgetts (Ed.), Higher education in a changing Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1966.

Lambert, W. Foreign students at a Canadian university. Unpublished paper, Department of Psychology, McGill University, May 1981.

Lévesque, G. Les étrangers au Québec. Montréal: Fédération des Associations de Professeurs des Universités du Québec, May 1981.

Magnan, J., Morey, E., & Russell, S. International students at Concordia: Report of the task force on culture and learning. Montréal:, Concordia University, 1982. (mimeograph)

Matas, R. Foreign students' fees to double by '83. Globe and Mail, February 25, 1982. p. 20.

McGill University. Report of the ad hoc committee on foreign students. Unpublished report, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, McGill University, April 16, 1982. (a)

McGill University, Registrar's Office. Countries whose students are exempt from differential fees as of November 1982. Unpublished document, November 1982. (b)

McMaster University. Report to the senate and to the board of governors of McMaster University. Unpublished report, Board/Senate Committee on Financial Assistance for Foreign Visa Students, McMaster University, December 14, 1977.

Ministère de l'éducation, Direction générale de l'enseignement supérieur. Politique relative aux droits de scolarité exigés des étudiants étrangers par les universités du Québec. Québec: Ministère de l'education, 1981. (mimeograph)

Morey, E. Personal communication, June 6, 1984.

National Conference of Canadian Universities and Colleges, Committee on Admission of Overseas Students. In Proceedings. Symposium presented at the thirty-seventh meeting of the National Conference of Canadian Universities and Colleges, Montréal, June 1961.

Neice, D.C., & Braun, P.H. A patron for the world? (Pt. 1) Ottawa: Canadian Bureau of International Education, 1977.

Norusis, M.J. Introductory statistics guide: SPSSx. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983.

Paterson, C., & Robinson, S.C. Funding sources: Funds available for foreign students to study in Canada and Canadians to study abroad. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau of International Education, 1977.

Paxton, J. (Ed.) The statesman's yearbook: 1982-83. (119th ed.). Suffolk: Macmillan, 1982.

Québec (Government of). Assemblée nationale, journal des débats, 20 (1). Québec: editeur officiel, 21 fevrier 1978.

Québec (Government of). Décret concernant une entente de réciprocité en matière de droits de scolarité avec la République du Rwanda. Québec: Le Greffier du conseil exécutif, 7 juillet 1982. (mimeograph)

Québec and federal government sign agreement. University Affairs, April 1978, p. 5.

RAND Corporation. A million random digits with 100,000 normal deviates. New York: Free Press, 1955.

Rao, L Brain drain and foreign students. New York: St. Martin, 1979.

Roberts, S.C., & Adam-Modley, K. Institutional policies: Admissions, fees, quotas for foreign students at Canadian post-secondary institutions. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau of International Education, 1977.

Ryten, E. Citizenship of graduate students in Canadian universities. Science Bulletin. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, Educational Division, April, 1972.

Schafer, D.P. A study of the scholarship programme of the department of external affairs. Unpublished report, Cultural Affairs Division of the Canadian Department of External Affairs. Ottawa, 1977.

Shaikh, F., & Simpson, D. Foreign students and Canadian foreign policy. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau of International Education, 1977.

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. World university service takes over government of Canada awards program. Council Update, February 1981, p. 3.

Spaulding, S., Flack, M.J., Tate, S., Mahan, P., & Marshall, C. The world's students in the United States. New York: Praeger, 1976.

Speakman, C. E., Jr. International exchange on education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966.

Statistics Canada. Universities: Enrolment and degrees. Ottawa: Department of Supply and Services, 1983-1984.

Statistics Canada, Education Division. Fall enrolment in universities and colleges: 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1972-76.

Support for students in Canada's interest says Axworthy. CAUT Bulletin, October 1982, pp. 7-8.

Symons, T.H.B., & Page, J.E. Some questions of balance. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1984.

Thibault, P. The international students situation in Canada. Paper presented at the fifth annual meeting of the National Union of Students, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, May, 1977.

UNESCO. Statistical yearbook: 1974-1983. Paris: UNESCO, 1975-1983. (a)

UNESCO. Study abroad 1948-1983 (23 vols.). Paris: UNESCO, 1948-1980. (b)

United Nations. United Nations conference on the least developed countries. Paris: United Nations, September 1981, (DPI/691).

United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. A beacon of hope - The exchange of persons program. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

Von Zur-Muehlen, M. Foreign students in Canada and Canadian students abroad: A statistical account. Unpublished project outline, 1983. (Available from Statistics Canada, Ottawa.)

Von Zur-Muehlen, M. Foreign students in Canada - A preliminary documentation. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1981.

Von Zur-Muehlen, M. Foreign students in Canada and Canadian students abroad. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1978. (a)

Von Zur-Muehlen, M. Foreign students in Canada in 1977-78. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1978. (b)

Von Zur-Muehlen, M. The foreign student issue updated. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1978. (c)

Von Zur-Muehlen, M. The foreign student issue in 1976-77. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau of International Education, 1977.

Von Zur-Muehlen, M. Foreign students at Canadian universities: A statistical comparison between Department of Manpower and Immigration Statistics and Statistics Canada data. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, Institutional and Public Finance Statistics Branch, 1976.(a)

Von Zur-Muehlen, M. Foreign students in Canada : Notes on some unresolved issues (Rev. ed.). Ottawa: Statistics Canada, Institutional and Public Finance Statistics Branch, 1976. (b)

Von Zur-Muehlen, M. Canadian students abroad and foreign students in Canada. (Pt. 1) Ottawa: Department of Secretary of State, Policy Division, 1975.

Walmsley, N. Canadian universities and international development. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1970.

Weston, J. Differential fes still cause concern. University Affairs, October 1983, pp. 5-6.

Williams, J., & Knapper, C.K, Attitudes and experiences of Foreign students at the University of Waterloo. Unpublished report, Counselling Services, University of Waterloo, June 1980.

Williams, P. A policy for overseas students: Summary. London: Overseas Students Trust, 1982.

Williams, P. (Ed.). The overseas student question. London: Heinemann, 1981.

Woodcock, L. Restrictions on visa students increasing. University Affairs, January 1977, p. 3.

Young, M.T.C. A survey of the Hong Kong students in Canadian Universities and colleges, with suggestions for prospective Hong Kong students coming to study in Canada. Unpublished masters thesis, McGill University, 1965.

Zinman-Madoff, E. Foreign student admission and enrolment policies in Canadian higher education: A case study of Québec universities. Unpublished masters thesis, McGill University, 1980.

APPENDIX A

COUNTRIES OF CITIZENSHIP OF STUDY POPULATION BY LEVEL OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND ACCORD STATUS

COUNTRY STATUS	Accord	Non-Accord
Developing	Gabon	Libya
	Algeria	Mauritius
	Tunisia	Nigeria
	Ivory Coast	Congo
	Morocco[	Zimbabwe
	Cameroun	Egypt
	Senegal	Kenya
	Mauritania	Ghana
	Togo	Madagascar
Least Developed	Central African Republic	Botswana
	Zaire	Sudan
	Upper Volta	Niger
	Rwanda	Benin
	Mali	Guinea
		Tanzania
		Burundi
		Ethiopia

Note. Countries have been listed from highest to lowest GNP in each category. Development level classifications are from the United Nations, 1981.

[Discontinued for students arriving after September, 1984.

APPENDIX B

COUNTRY GROUPINGS FOR TABLE 7

a

Total Europe, South Africa, Israel, Japan, Australia, New Zealand.

b

Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela.

c

Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dutch Guiana, Ecuador, French Guiana, Paraguay, Peru, Uruquay, Algeria, Morrocco, Rhodesia, Tunisia, Cyprus, Korea North, Korea South, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Syria, Taiwan, Thailand, Costa Rica, Cuba, Mexico, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Panama, Panama Canal Zone, Puerto Rico.

d

Angola, Congo, Egypt, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Malagasy Republic, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leon, Togoland, Zaire, Zambia, Burma, China, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Lebanon, Mongolia, Macao, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Timor - Portuguese, Vietnam North, Vietnam South, Honduras, Namibia.

e

Antigua, Bahamas Islands, Bardados, Belize, Bermuda, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guadeloupe, Jamaica, St. Vincent, Trinidad - Tobago, others.

f

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Brunei, Laos, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, Botswana, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea - Portuguese, Lesotho, Malawi, Yemen Arab Republic, Mali, Niger, Rwanda, Somali Republic, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Upper Volta.

Source: Von Zur-Muehlen, M. Foreign Students in Canada and Canadian Students Abroad. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1978. p.44.

McGill University

ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY STUDIES IN EDUCATION

APPENDIX C*

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

This questionnaire is for and about international students in Canada and the impact of fee policies now being applied to international students by most Provincial governments. Please read each question carefully and indicate your response by checking (✓) the appropriate alternative or by supplying the appropriate information. Please print.

I PERSONAL BACKGROUND

1. Of what country/countries are you a citizen?

_____

2. What University or school are you now attending?

_____ McGill University
_____ University of Montréal
_____ Ecole Polytechnique

*This questionnaire was also administered in the French language.

Postal address 3724 McTavish Street, Montreal, PQ, Canada H3A 1Y2

3. What is your field of study?

_____ Education
_____ Law
_____ Management
_____ Arts (examples: Languages, Political Science, Sociology)
_____ Religious Studies
_____ Agricultural or Veterinary Sciences
_____ Engineering or Architecture
_____ Science (examples: Chemistry, Computer Science, Mathematics)
_____ Medicine or Dentistry
_____ Nursing
_____ Other. Please specify:

_____
_____

4. At what level of study are you enrolled?

_____ Undergraduate level
_____ Masters level
_____ Doctoral level
_____ Other. Please specify:

_____
_____

II INFORMATION ON FEES AND RELATED TOPICS

5. Do you pay the same amount in tuition fees as a Canadian in the same program as you?

_____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Do not know

] Please skip to question # 7

6. **Please indicate which (if any) of the following factors affect the level of your tuition fees.**

_____You come from a country which has an educational accord with the Province of Québec.

_____You are involved in a special academic exchange program recognized by the Québec or Canadian government. Please specify which program:

_____

_____You are specializing in the study of the French language.

_____You are a diplomatic representative or, the spouse or child of a diplomat.

_____You are awaiting refugee status.

_____None of the above.

7. **What is your general opinion of the policy of charging international students higher tuition fees than Canadian students?**

_____Fair, since my country has a similar policy.

_____Fair, even though my country has a different policy.

_____Unfair, since my country has a different policy.

_____Unfair, even though my country has a similar policy.

_____No comment.

III YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

8. **Did you apply to a University in your home country for your current program of study?**

_____Yes

_____No

9. Were you offered a place in a University in your home country for your current program of study? (Whether or not you decided to attend that University)

_____Yes
_____No

10. Did you apply to any foreign Universities, other than the one you are now attending for your current program of study?

_____Yes. Please specify which other Universities:

_____
_____
_____
_____

_____No

11. Why did you choose to attend the University you are now attending?

_____Your scholarship applied here
_____You were accepted
_____Lower costs
_____Relatives or friends living here
_____Program of studies offered
_____Recommendation of friends in home country
_____Good reputation of school
_____Other. Please specify:

_____
_____

12. In what year did you first enroll at the University that you are now attending?

19_____.

And in what year do you expect to complete your current program?

19_____.

IV YOU AND YOUR FAMILY'S OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUND

13. **Before coming to Canada did you have any paid employment?**

_____Yes. I had full-time work.
_____Yes. I had part-time work.
_____No. If "no", skip to question # 16.

14. **In the following space give a brief description of the type of work you did before coming abroad to study:**

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

15. **You were:**

_____A government employee
_____An employee of a non-governmental organization or enterprise
_____Self-employed, or owner of a business

16. In the following spaces give brief descriptions of the type of work done by <u>your parents</u> and <u>your husband or wife</u> (if applicable). If these persons have done more than one type of work or, if they are currently not working, retired or deceased, consider the occupation which they held for the longest period during their career(s).

Your father's work:

_____
_____

Your mother's work:

_____
_____

Your husband/wife's work:

_____
_____

17. Please provide further information about your family's occupational history by checking (✓) the appropriate blanks in the following table.

	A Government Employee	An Employee of a Non-governmental Organization	Self-employed or Owner of a Business	Not Applicable
Your father is/was:				
Your mother is/was:				
Your husband/ wife is/was:				

V HOUSING AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES, HERE AND AT HOME

18. For most of the last five years before you came to study in Canada, you lived in a dwelling,

_____ owned by you.
_____ owned by your family.
_____ rented by you.
_____ rented by your family.
_____ Other. Please specify:

_____
_____
_____

The following three questions (# 19,20,21) deal with the place where you lived before coming abroad to study. If you lived in a dwelling that you yourself owned or rented for at least five years, apply the following three questions to that dwelling. If you lived in a dwelling that your parents or family owned or rented during the last five years before coming abroad to study, apply the following three questions to your parent or family dwelling.

19. What is the structure of the dwelling?

_____A detached private home
_____A row house or house attached to others
_____An apartment building
_____Part of a commercial building
_____Other. Please specify:

_____

20. How many separate bedrooms are in the dwelling? (Not including dual-purpose rooms, such as a living room which is used as a bedroom at night.)

_____None
_____One
_____Two to four
_____Five to seven
_____More than seven

21. How many persons usually live in this dwelling?

_____Two or less
_____Three to five
_____Six to eight
_____More than eight

22. How many domestics (cooks, maids, chauffeurs, gardeners, etc.), if any, do you and/or your family usually employ?

_____

23. Do you or you parents own any land or buildings other than those of the main dwelling?

_____Yes. Please specify what type:

_____

_____

_____

_____No

24. How much do you pay per month for your accomodation here in Canada? (Including heating)

_____Less than 100^{00} per month
_____Between 100^{00} and 200^{00} per month
_____Between 201^{00} and 300^{00} per month
_____More than 300^{00} per month
_____Other. Please specify:

_____

25. Are you currently supporting or helping to support...? (Either in Canada or elsewhere)

	Yes		No
A wife or husband	____		____
Parents, other family or friends	____		____
Children	____	Please specify their ages:	____

_____

_____

26. Did you obtain other post-secondary (College or University level) before coming into the program in which you are now studying? (Include any programs previously completed at your present University.)

_____ Yes. If "yes", please indicate the institutions in which you studied and how you were supported during that period, as shown in the examples below.

_____ No

Institution, Country	Self-supported or Received Support of Family or Friends	Received Support of Scholarship or Bursary (If so, indicate which one)
(examples)		
(University of Nairobi, Kenya	✓	)
(University of Toronto, Canada		Canada Council Scholarship)

VI SUPPORT

27. Which of the following sources of financial support are you receiving during your current program of study? Check(✓) one or more items.

_____ Self(personal savings)

_____ Family and/or friends

_____ Scholarship (bursary or grant) from a source in your home country. Please specify the source:

_____

_____ Scholarship (bursary or grant) from an international agency. Please specify the agency:

_____

_____ Scholarship (bursary or grant) from a source in Canada. Please specify the source:

_____

_____ Scholarship, bursary, grant or fellowship from the University you are now attending. Specify the award:

_____

_____ Earnings from employment here in Canada: teaching or research assistant or other. Please specify the type of employment:

_____

28. What percentage of financial support do you get from yourself, your family and/or your friends during your current period of study?

_____0-25%
_____25-50%
_____50-75%
_____75-100%

29. Does your country place any restrictions on the exchange of foreign currency?

_____Yes. Please specify the extent or type of restrictions:

_____

_____No
_____Do not know

30. Which of the following statements best describes your efforts to obtain a work permit in Canada?

____ You have never applied but plan to apply.
_____You have never applied and do not plan to apply.
_____You already applied but were turned down.
_____You applied and were granted permission to work.

31. If you are receiving a scholarship, bursary, grant or fellowship, check (✓) which of the following expenses (one or more) does it cover? If you do not receive any of these types of support, please skip to question # 34.

_____Travel to and from Canada
_____Tuition fees
_____Accommodation and food
_____Additional spending money, allowance or salary

32. <u>If you are receiving a scholarship, bursary, grant or fellowship,</u> for how long do you expect to receive it?

_____ school years.

_____ An unlimited number of school years, as long as required.

_____ Do not know.

33. Does your scholarship, grant, bursary or fellowship oblige you to complete a period of work/service when you return to your home country?

_____ Yes

_____ No

_____ Do not know

34. This is the end of the questionnaire. If you have any additional comments to make about your own study experiences in Canada or on the topic of fee policies for international students, please feel free to add them in the following space. (Use the back of this sheet if necessary.)

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND HELPFUL PARTICIPATION.