

MONTREAL ANGLOPHONES:
SOCIAL DISTANCE AND EMIGRATION

by

MELANIE LANGE

© NOVEMBER 1985

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts (Sociology) in the Faculty
of Graduate Studies and Research of McGill University.

ABSTRACT

Using sample data from a 1978 survey of 332 Anglophone residents of Montreal, this study examines Anglophone emigration from Quebec with emphasis on both migrant selectivity and migrant motivation.

The central dependent variable is a stated propensity to migrate. Of the major demographic and economic variables traditionally associated with migration it is found that, apart from age of the respondent, no single factor or collection of factors adequately explain significant amounts of variance in intentions to leave Quebec.

A major part of the study considers the encapsulation of the Anglophone community in Quebec, and examines a possible association of social distance from Francophones with intentions to leave the province. A Bogardus social distance scale is used to measure attitudes towards linguistic group contact, while behaviour is measured with scales representing interpersonal contact on various levels. The data show some evidence that social distance variables may explain some of the variance in propensity to leave Quebec, particularly among specific sub-groups of the Anglophone population.

SOMMAIRE

Utilisant les données d'échantillonnage d'un sondage effectué en 1978 auprès de 332 anglophones résidant à Montréal, cette étude examine l'émigration anglophone hors du Québec et aborde principalement les aspects de la sélectivité ainsi que la motivation des migrants. La principale variable dépendante est celle de la propension déclarée à migrer.

De l'ensemble des variables démographiques et économiques principales et traditionnellement associées avec le phénomène de la migration, on remarque qu'à l'exception de l'âge des répondants, il n'y a aucun facteur spécifique qui explique de façon satisfaisante une quantité significative de variance dans les intentions de quitter le Québec.

Une partie importante de l'étude est consacrée à la fermeture de la communauté anglophone du Québec et examine une association possible entre leur distance sociale des francophones et leurs intentions de quitter le Québec. Une échelle de distance sociale de type Bogardus est utilisée pour mesurer les attitudes de chacun en ce qui a trait au contact entre les groupes linguistiques. Le comportement est mesuré en fonction des échelles représentant le contact interpersonnel à différents niveaux. Les données recueillies démontrent que les variables de distance sociale peuvent parfois expliquer le phénomène de la variance en propension à quitter le Québec, particulièrement parmi les sous-groupes spécifiques de la population anglophone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER ONE: DETERMINANTS OF MIGRATION.....	9
1.1 Theoretical Issues.....	9
1.2 The Migrant.....	11
1.3 Previous Findings in Migration Research.....	14
1.4 Appropriate Perspectives in Migration Case Studies.....	21
1.5 Social Distance as a Motivating Factor for Migration...	22
Conclusions.....	24
CHAPTER TWO: A SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF ANGLOPHONES IN QUEBEC.....	25
2.1 Educational Achievement.....	26
2.2 Occupational Achievement.....	28
2.3 Income.....	33
Conclusions.....	34
CHAPTER THREE: THE ENCAPSULATION OF MONTREAL ANGLOPHONES....	49
3.1 The Setting.....	50
3.2 The Measurement of Social Distance.....	52
3.3 Language as Social Distance.....	55
3.4 Attitudinal Social Distance: the Bogardus Scale.....	58
3.5 Behavioural Social Distance: Contact with Francophones.	59
Conclusions.....	64
CHAPTER FOUR: INTENTIONS TO LEAVE QUEBEC.....	84
4.1 The Propensity to Migrate as a Dependent Variable.....	84
4.2 The Magnitude of the Movement.....	85
4.3 Age and Lifestyle.....	86
4.4 Socio-Economic Status Selectivity.....	88
4.5 Stated Motivations for Leaving Quebec.....	90
4.6 Motivations and Migration Intentions.....	91
Conclusions.....	93
CHAPTER FIVE: SOCIAL DISTANCE AND INTENTIONS TO LEAVE QUEBEC	106
5.1 Stress in the Anglophone Community.....	106
5.2 Migration as Strategy.....	108
5.3 Migration Intentions and Perception of Prejudice.....	109
5.4 Migration and Knowledge of French.....	110
5.5 Migration and Contact with Francophones.....	112
5.6 Social Distance Attitudes and Intentions to Leave Quebec.....	114
Conclusions.....	115

	Page
CHAPTER SIX: IDENTIFYING MIGRANT TYPES.....	128
6.1 The Peterson Typology.....	128
6.2 Operationalizing the Peterson Typology.....	129
6.3 Distinguishing Characteristics of Innovative and Conservative Types.....	131
Conclusions.....	134
CONCLUSION.....	144
APPENDIX I	
APPENDIX II	
APPENDIX III	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
INTRODUCTION	
I-1 Net interprovincial migration for Quebec, 1965-82.....	8.1
I-2 Population of Quebec by mother tongue, selected years.	8.2
 CHAPTER TWO	
2-1 Educational achievement for Quebec francophones, non-francophones, Montreal Anglophones.....	37
2-2 Highest degree received by ethnic background.....	38
2-3 Average education of Anglophones by age group.....	39
2-4 Highest degree received by age cohort.....	40
2-5 Occupational position: A comparison of Montreal Anglophones with the Canadian population.....	41
2-6 Occupational status (Blishen) for francophones, non-francophones, Montreal Anglophones, by sex.....	42
2-7 Occupational status by ethnic background.....	43
2-8 Occupational status (Blishen) by age.....	44
2-9 Intergenerational mobility: Respondent's present occupation compared to father's last full-time occupation.....	45
2-10 Intragenerational mobility: Respondent's present occupation compared with Respondent's first occupation.....	46
2-11 Household income for 1977: Montreal Anglophones.....	47
2-12 Household income by Respondent's ethnic background....	48
 CHAPTER THREE	
3-1 Self-rated proficiency in French: Montreal Anglophones.....	68
3-2 Percentage of Respondents using only English in various settings.....	69
3-3 Self-rated proficiency in French by Age Group.....	70
3-4 Self-rated proficiency in French by level of education.....	71
3-5 Self-rated proficiency in French by ethnic background.....	72
3-6 Bogardus social distance for Montreal Anglophones; Total, and by ethnic background.....	73
3-7 Contact variables: marriage, friends, neighbours, co-workers: zero-order correlations.....	74
3-8 Spouse's mother tongue.....	75
3-9 Spouse's mother tongue by age group.....	76
3-10 Spouse's mother tongue by ethnic background.....	77

	Page
3-11 Contact with francophones: number of francophone friends.....	78
3-12 Francophone friends by age, education, ethnic background.....	79
3-13 Contact with francophones: next door neighbours.....	80
3-14 Francophone neighbours by age, education, ethnic background.....	81
3-15 Contact with francophones: co-workers.....	82
3-16 Francophone co-workers by age, education, ethnic background.....	83

CHAPTER FOUR

4-1 Intentions to leave Quebec, immediate and future plans.	96
4-2 Chances of leaving Quebec in the next five years by age group.....	97
4-3 Chances of leaving Quebec by Respondent's stage in lifecycle.....	98
4-4 Chances of leaving Quebec by Respondent's education....	99
4-5 Chances of leaving Quebec by occupational status.....	100
4-6 Chances of leaving Quebec by Respondent's household income.....	101
4-7 Intentions to leave Quebec by educational attainment by age.....	102
4-8 Stated motivations for leaving Quebec.....	103
4-9 Prime motivation for wanting to leave Quebec by age group.....	104
4-10 Prime motivation for wanting to leave Quebec by intentions to leave Quebec.....	105

CHAPTER FIVE

5-1 Reaction to Bill 101.....	117
5-2 Respondent's perception of prejudice against Anglophones in Quebec.....	118
5-3 Perception of job discrimination against Anglophones in Quebec.....	119
5-4 Perception of prejudice against Anglophones by ethnic background.....	120
5-5 Perception of job discrimination against Anglophones by ethnic background.....	121
5-6 Zero-order correlations of intentions to migrate with perception of prejudice against Anglophones by age, education, and ethnic background.....	122
5-7 Intentions to migrate by Respondent's proficiency in French.....	123
5-8 Intentions to migrate by spouse's mother tongue.....	124

5-9	Pearson's r correlations: Intentions to migrate with contact with francophone friends by age, education, and ethnic background.....	125
5-10	Pearson's r correlations: Intentions to migrate with contact with francophone co-workers by age, education, and ethnic background.....	126
5-11	Intentions to migrate by social distance (Bogardus)....	127

CHAPTER SIX

6-1	Distribution of emigrant type.....	137
6-2	Emigrant type by sex.....	138
6-3	Emigrant type by average age.....	139
6-4	Emigrant type: mean education in years.....	140
6-5	Emigrant type by occupation.....	141
6-6	Emigrant type by ethnic background.....	142
6-7	Contact variables by emigrant type, mean scores.....	143

INTRODUCTION

During the 1977-1978 census year, 72,127 people left the province of Quebec. This was not only an increase of 17,600 emigrants from the previous census year but also exceeded the number of out migrants for every census year since 1970 (see Table i-1). [1] During this same period Quebec continued to have the lowest interprovincial gross migration rate - 15.5 per 1000. Recent research has clearly shown that the accelerating number of emigrants was largely composed of English-speaking Quebecers.

As a percentage of the total Quebec population, residents of English mother tongue have shown a steady decline. Whereas in 1991 they constituted close to twenty percent of the population, Table i-2 illustrates that in recent years this percentage has fallen rather dramatically. In 1971, English-speaking Quebecers represented 13.8% of the total population. By 1981, however, this percentage had dwindled to 10.9%.

Early studies conducted in 1971 for the Gendron Commission found that while Anglophones represented only one-sixth of the total population of Quebec, they made up two-thirds of those people

- 2 -

leaving the province (Charbonneau, Maheu, 1973). Similarly, 1976 census sample data showing provincial emigrants from Quebec by mother tongue indicates that in a five-year period, 1971-1976, a high percentage of Anglophones left the province. More recent sample data available reveals that almost one-half of the graduates of Quebec's English language high schools have already left the province or intend to leave (Caldwell; 1978).

Of course, emigration is only one factor which has contributed to the shrinking English population of Quebec. Other contributing factors have included the high death rates and low birth rates of this rapidly aging population. Moreover, this population has been heavily dependent upon immigration as a form of growth (Ouellet, 1964). Further Henripin (1971) and Caldwell (1974) have both shown that, given low birth rates, this dependence has resulted in a substantial reduction of the population in recent years. This has been particularly hard felt in the sector of British origin which, as a proportion of the Quebec population, has been shown to be declining ever since a census distinction between origin and mother tongue was made in 1931.

As the numerical strength of the English-speaking population of Quebec has depended historically on a continuing influx of Anglo-

phones from other provinces and abroad as well as the assimilation of non-English, non-French immigrants into the English sector, two recent developments have threatened the growth and stability of the Anglophone minority. First of all, recent immigrants to Quebec have come more from French-speaking countries than was the case in the past. In 1976, for example, 41.7% of migrants admitted into Quebec were capable of speaking French on arrival. Secondly, government legislation has discouraged assimilation into the English sector by compelling newcomers to send their children to French schools.

All of these factors have contributed to a very real demographic crisis for the English population of Quebec. The emigration of Anglophones is more interesting at the sociological level, however, and therefore invites analysis at the micro level. That increasing rates of outmigration have paralleled major changes in the social and political institutions of the province suggests strongly that uncertainty and fear of encroaching francization are prime factors motivating Anglophones to leave Quebec. For the most part, journalistic evidence supports this hypothesis, but there has been little traditional migration research conducted.

Data from a survey completed in 1978 affords us the opportunity

to ask two fundamental questions: who has left Quebec?, and why did they leave?

Methodology

This study is based on interviews with Anglophones residing in the municipalities of Greater Montreal, conducted during the Summer of 1978. Three hundred and thirty-two English-speaking adults were contacted first by telephone and then interviewed in person through a probability sampling method.

The initial respondent contact was made using a random digit dialing procedure. Briefly, this method assumed that English-speaking residents of Montreal would be distributed equally within each telephone exchange. A list of these exchanges was compiled with proportions equivalent to the population density in each exchange. Finally, four-digit random numbers were assigned to each exchange. This procedure was repeated five times, given that many of the numbers obtained were out of service numbers. (See Appendix III)

The second stage in the sampling method involved the identification of Anglophones. It was not the intention of this study to limit the analysis to the British charter group since ethnic origin

often poses definitional problems. However, the heterogeneous character [2] of the English population at large threatened to make analysis and subsequent generalizations extremely difficult for a small sample. Accordingly, a compromise selection procedure for inclusion was based on the following criteria: where English was stated as mother tongue, or, where English was spoken as a first language in the home and the respondent had been born in an Anglophone country. This part of the selection process was performed by trained telephone interviewers who attempted to make appointments for interviews with respondents who satisfied the selection criteria.

One further criterion of selection was based on the variables of age, sex, and position in household. It was decided that both males and females aged 18 to 65 years were to be included in the sample in order to ensure the integrity of the random number procedure used to select household members. For each telephone number corresponding to a household, the individual answering the call was asked to list the members of the household: males by age seniority, then females by age seniority. From a pre-selected number, the interviewer then selected the particular person in the household to be interviewed.

The personal interviews were conducted by trained university

graduates using a standardized questionnaire. The majority of the interviews were conducted in the homes of respondents, while a small number of respondents were interviewed at their place of work. In general, the interest and co-operation of both interviewers and respondents was very high. The response rate was approximately 70% of the total number of qualifying individuals. Indeed, even in the case of those individuals who refused to agree to personal interviews, one-half did consent to a brief telephone interview with questions extracted from the questionnaire. However, it should be noted that these latter respondents have not been included in this study. The characteristics of these respondents were not significantly different for respondents who consented to the complete interview.

The final sample consisted of 145 males and 187 females. Of the total, 54% were found to have been born in Montreal while over one-half of this group had never lived elsewhere. Further, 47% of the sample identified themselves as "English-Canadians", 17% as "British-Canadians", and 15% as "Jewish-Canadians". The remaining 21% identified themselves as members of other ethnic groups. The major demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the sample correspond to census distributions.

- 7 -

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of two hundred and fifty-eight questions that required an average of one hour to be completed in the interview situation. A major part of the questionnaire solicited background information concerning age, education, occupational history, migration history, and family background. A second part of the questionnaire required respondents to provide a detailed account of the geographic location of their parents, siblings and children. A third section included a replication of the Bogardus social distance scale as well as questions designed to measure the extent to which the respondent had contact with Francophones or members of other ethnic groups. A fourth section was included which attempted to measure migration intentions: present plans, future plans, and plans given specific scenarios for the province. Finally, a number of attitudinal questions were included to measure contentment with political, economic and social conditions in the province.

NOTES

1. Quebec net inter-provincial migration in 1977-78 was considerably higher than the 1981-82 period. Popular consensus is that the Anglophone 'exodus' was greatest in this earlier period as a result of the election of the Parti Quebecois in 1976.
2. It should be noted that there exists a tendency to view the English-speaking population of Quebec as being a far more homogeneous body than it is in actual circumstances.

TABLE I-1

NET INTERPROVINCIAL MIGRATION FOR QUEBEC, 1965-1982

	Quebec pop.	In-migration	Out-migration	net	Percent Out-migrants*
1965-66	5,685,000	45,252	54,149	-8906	1.0%
1967-68	5,864,000	40,457	56,183	-15,726	1.0%
1969-70	5,985,000	36,226	72,067	-35,841	1.2%
1971-72	6,027,764	38,810	59,271	-20,461	1.0%
1973-74	6,081,000	40,773	55,909	-15,136	.9%
1975-76	6,188,000	32,915	45,557	-12,642	.7%
1977-78	6,283,100	25,222	72,127	-46,905	1.2%
1981-82	6,438,405	26,920	50,211	-23,291	.8%

Note: 1966, 1971, and 1976 are census years, others are population estimates - see Pop. estimates 1961-70 Canadian Statistical Rev. Historical Summary 1971-78, 1981-82 Statistics Canada catalogue 91-201 Annual Demographic Division: International and Interprovincial Migration in Canada.

* % of out-migrants: calculated as $\frac{\text{out-migration}}{\text{population}} \times 100$.

TABLE I-2

POPULATION OF QUEBEC BY MOTHER TONGUE FOR SELECTED YEARS

Year	Mother Tongue						Total
	English		French		Other		
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
1971	789,185	13.8	4,867,250	80.7	371,330	6.1	6,027,765
1976	800,680	12.8	4,989,245	80.0	444,520	7.1	6,234,445
1981	706,110	10.9	5,307,015	82.4	425,280	6.6	6,438,405

Source: Statistics Canada catalogue 91-201 Annual.

CHAPTER ONE

DETERMINANTS OF MIGRATION

Introduction

This chapter reviews the major findings in migration literature with respect to the questions of migrant selectivity and migrant motivation. The concept of social distance is introduced as a possible determining factor in the migrant's decision-making process.

1.1 Theoretical Issues

A proper definition of migration must be inclusive in two ways. It must, first, include the range of population movements that can legitimately be called migration, and second, suggest the fact that migration has multiple causes and consequences for the migrant, his place of origin, and his place of destination.

While many definitions exist, most authors accept the phenomenon as the process by which an individual or group undertakes 'a permanent or semi-permanent change of residence.' (Lee, 1966)

The more recent literature tends to utilize the conceptualization provided by Mangalam and Schwarzweller (1970). They describe

migration as:

a relatively permanent moving away of a collectivity, called migrants, from one geographic location to another, preceded by decision-making on the part of the migrants on the basis of a hierarchically ordered set of values or valued ends and resulting in changes in the interactional system of the migrants.

The most persistent problem faced by the student of migration is that the subject matter covers territory common to several disciplines. The literature reflects the different concerns of demographers, economists, sociologists and others. Moreover, the focus tends to be centered on one of three units of analysis; the actual migration, the area of origin, destination, or the migrating unit.

Studies which emphasize the migration tend to be concerned with the measurement and prediction of volume and distance. (See, for example, Ravenstein, 1889; Stouffer, 1940; Gallaway, 1967.

When the unit of analysis is the place of origin and/or destination, discussion is centered around structural variables which tend to facilitate, encourage, or inhibit migration. Here, the push-pull paradigm is still strongly favoured and economic fac-

tors such as labour market and differential income are emphasized heavily (Ladinsky, 1967; Courchène, 1970; McInnis, 1971; Vander-camp, 1971). Finally, where the unit of analysis is the individual or migrating collectivity, research has focused generally on predisposing individual characteristics and, more recently, on motives for migration based on the migrants' subjective perceptions of conditions encouraging or inhibiting migration.

While it is evident that for any particular migration all three units of analysis should be considered, the awkwardness and expense of such comprehensive migration studies make them a rarity. It is not surprising then that there exists something of a theoretic vacuum. As Stone (1970: 76) has noticed:

Almost all of what has passed for substantive theory in the literature about migration is a sequential listing of factors believed to be relevant in explaining migration. With the citation of each factor, there is usually some statement of reasons why the factor is cited, but there is no theory about simultaneous interaction of the factors, and no attempt is made to formulate general causal models in which the listed factors appear as aspects of the causal mechanisms.

1.2 The Migrant

To a great extent, the literature on migration has been influenced by developments in migration itself. As migratory movements have

become more characteristically short-distance moves by free groups of migrants, a socio-psychological orientation has become more popular. This approach departs from the earlier determinism of push-pull reasoning insofar as authors emphasize the participation of a rational migrant, which therefore necessitates analysis at the level of the migrant. Mangalam and Schwarzweller (1970) have suggested that two major questions be addressed in any study of migration: 'who are the migrants?' and 'why are they migrating?'.

The question of who migrates is dealt with amply in migration literature. Most frequently, the analysis of aggregate census data is used to determine the association between rates of movement and various demographic and social attributes of migrants. That migrants are not a representative cross-section of the population they leave suggests that movement has patterned social, economic, demographic and psychological determinants. Moreover, it suggests that migrants have values that are distinct from those held by non-migrants.

It has been pointed out that the tendency in formulating explanatory statements on migration has been to isolate objective structural determinants of migration, infer the influences of these determinants in terms of assumptions concerning the migrant's

orientation to his environment, and then impute the motives to migrate (Mangalam and Schwarzweller, 1971: 105). Consequently, the question of why people migrate has most often been raised only indirectly. This may well result from the fact that most of the data have been drawn from census records. In recent years, several authorities have expressed a need for data from additional surveys to enable a proper investigation of the social processes involved in migration (Mangalam and Schwarzweller, 1970; Stone, 1970; and Shaw, 1975). In particular, Stone (1970) has noted that the question of why people migrate has received virtually no attention in the Canadian context.

In justifying a study which focuses exclusively on the migrant as the unit of analysis, the fact that there is a specified need for continued research is convincing. However, the real argument for using the migrant rests on the assumption that the individual's subjective perceptions of his social, economic, and physical conditions assume an important role in his behaviour because he makes judgements based on incomplete information. More simply, the worst of structural conditions will not encourage migration if they are not perceived as intolerable.

1.3 Previous Findings in Migration Research

a. Selectivity

Although much of the literature discusses 'migrant selectivity', attempts to unify universal migration differentials have been disappointing. Shaw (1975: 48) has noted that "if principles of selectivity are to be built into general models of migration the selective components may have to be weighted according to the setting and composition of the population subgroups which are within the domain of the model." Similarly, Mangalam and Schwarzweller (1970) have advanced a social action framework seemingly capable of delineating the characteristics of migrants in terms of the relevant elements of social organization. They argue that, for a particular case of migration, some of the differentials take greater importance than others. It can further be suggested that Bogue may well have dealt most realistically with the absence of consensus in asserting that, with the exception of age, no real universals exist. It is nevertheless still possible to outline some of the major differentials which appear consistently in internal migratory movements in Canada and the United States.

Age and Life Cycle

American and Canadian data have shown consistently that age alone

- 15 -

accounts for most of the variance in migration. In fact, age appears to be the only assured universal. Beshers (1961), and Tarver (1964), have demonstrated support for the theory that migration varies inversely with age for interstate migration in the United States. This finding is confirmed for Canadian data which point to the relative magnitude of difference between older and younger migrants (Stone, 1969, 1970, Vandercamp, 1973; Beaman, 1973). Stone (1978) has analysed 1971 census data and shown that young adults aged twenty to thirty-four years of age engaged most often in repetitive change of residence when compared with other age groups.

Broadly, the interpretation for variations in migration rates between age groups is explained by the role dispositions associated with age changes. Age-related processes such as marriage, family formation, and career mobility often necessitate a change in residence. In addition, it is generally assumed that opportunities, costs, and benefits associated with the act of migration are unevenly distributed in given dimensions of the life field. A number of authors have charted stages in nuclear family development, showing that the combination of age, marriage, and number of children are related closely to the likelihood of migration. (Rossi, 1955; Bell, 1968; Leslie and Richardson, 1961; Speare, 1970; Long, 1972).

Socio-Economic Status.

There is strong evidence to suggest that migration ratios are generally highest for those with the highest levels of education. Stone (1969) used 1961 census data to show that, in both rural and urban areas, migrants had higher levels of educational attainment than non-migrants. His later analysis of 1971 data has confirmed that migration tends to be greatest among persons with university education. American data has provided overwhelming support for marked education differentials in migration. Bogue, 1969; Ladinsky, 1967).

Given the close association between education and occupation, it is not surprising that migrants tend to be positively selected according to their occupational status (see Stone, 1969, 1978; Richmond, 1969; Beshers, 1961; Tarver, 1964; Miller, 1976. Vandercamp (1968) and others have shown that migration can be interpreted largely as a response to employment differentials and that the more highly skilled the occupation, the more likely the case that supply and demand for the skill will extend from the local, to regional, to national levels.

Other Attributes.

In general, few other attributes of the migrant have been shown to explain significant amounts of variance from non-migrants; however, some findings are worth mentioning. As an example of

17

what Shaw (1975) has called 'probabilistic models', Morrison (1967) has hypothesized that individuals are presumed to undergo specific risks of migrating during given intervals of time. Risks are assumed to decrease as a person continues to reside in the same location and becomes socially and culturally integrated into his community. This seems to be an elaboration of the 'migrant stock' theory where past migrants are found to be better candidates for repeat migration as opposed to non-migrants. McInnis (1964) found that this was a most significant variable in accounting for interregional migration in Canada during the period from 1956 to 1961.

Finally, in the Canadian context, cultural factors appear to have some influence, as a significantly higher percentage of persons of British origin migrate as compared to persons of French origin. Of course, this is hardly surprising given the linguistic and cultural barriers that serve to inhibit francophone emigration outside Quebec.

b. Motivating Factors in Migration

Turning to the work which addresses the issue of why people migrate, it is found that most of the available research is inferential, focusing on structural factors assumed to facilitate or inhibit migration. Among those micro-studies which consider

the migrant as the unit of analysis, Stone (1974) has recognized two major perspectives. The first emphasizes the interpretation of migration as a response to stress, while the second uses the concept of a decision maker engaged in a cost-benefit calculation of his best interests.

It is interesting to observe that these two perspectives are similar to the early 'Typology of Migration' provided by Peterson (1958). He described two possible migrant types: the 'Conservative' migrant reacting in response to a change in conditions in an attempt to retain the status quo; and the 'Innovative' migrant who moves as a means to achieve something new. It would appear then that the stress perspective is most likely to be associated with the behaviour of the conservative migrant, while the cost-benefit perspective is more pertinent to the activity of the innovative migrant. Following the perspective of migrants, Beshers and Nishiura (1961) have put forward a typology of migrant decision-makers which defines migrants as either "purposive/rational", future-oriented, or "short run hedonists", who respond to short term situational factors.

These very similar conceptualizations of migrant types, albeit simplistic, would seem to facilitate the development of concise and meaningful comparative statements when confronted with a

number of variables shown to have some effect on migrant motivation. Unfortunately, in spite of efforts similar to Peterson's, very little attention has been paid to the use of such typologies as conceptual tools.

Stress Perspectives

The clearest expression of the stress perspective is outlined by Wolpert in a theoretical proposition produced in 1966. He states that, in addition to push and pull forces which may be latent in the migration decision, moderate amounts of stress may frequently encourage search behaviour. Stress tends to be defined as subjectively-felt deprivations, whether physical, social, political or economic. Therefore, in investigating reasons for migrating, it is necessary to give weighted attention to the individual's perception of conditions. Evidence supporting this perspective has been provided by Rossi (1955), and Lee (1966), whose respective data illustrate how reactions to environmental factors may vary in terms of the differing tolerance levels of individuals.

For the most part, much has been made of interregional migration as a function of man's response to situations of economic stress. McInnis (1964), Courchène (1970), Nickson (1967), Tulloch and

Macmillan (1972); and Jackson (1975) have all demonstrated the prominence of job-related factors in the stated motivations of interregional migrants in Canada. However, while it cannot be denied that virtually all moves in North America have economic significance, McInnis has admitted that a simple economic model obtains best results when it is applied to specific groups of highly mobile individuals. Similarly, Lansing and Mueller (1967) found that although the economic motive dominated decisions to migrate, a simple model of man as an economic maximizer was unfounded. As a result, conditions of stress have been expanded to include indices of community satisfaction, complaints about residence, and family situation.

The Cost-Benefit Perspective

This second major perspective most often views the individual as weighing the advantages and disadvantages of moving in a calculative cost-benefit analysis of this situation. Sjaastad (1961, 1962), and Speare, Jr. (1970) have developed decision-making models which appear competent mathematically but are nevertheless negligent of the more fundamental processes involved in the migration decision. A more important criticism of this approach is that costs and benefits are extremely difficult to document sufficiently for individual cases. Moreover,

it can be very hazardous to assume accurate information on the part of the migrant regarding such things as wage differentials in place of origin and destination.

1.4 Appropriate Perspectives in Migration Case Studies

The two perspectives outlined above are not mutually exclusive. However, for a particular case study of migration, the choice of perspective made by the researcher will undoubtedly be influenced by structural factors prominent in the migrants' environment. Where migration is investigated as a response to stress, there will probably exist strong push forces in the migrants' area of origin. In contrast, when the cost-benefit perspective is emphasized, both push and pull factors will be present. In both types of studies the question of migrant selectivity must be addressed. Lee (1960) and Bogue (1960) have hypothesized that the relationship between migrant selectivity and migrant motivation is such that migrants who respond to push factors are in general selected negatively while those who respond to pull factors are selected positively.

The Quebec Case

Political, social, and economic conditions present during the time in which this study was undertaken suggested strongly that we

consider the Anglophone as a potentially 'conservative migrant type' responding to the stress of 'being English' in a rapidly francicizing Quebec. Thus, it was hypothesized that migration intentions could at least partially be explained as a statement of dissociation from francisation.

1.5 Social Distance as a Motivating Factor for Migration

Social distance can most simply be described as deliberate behaviour or attitudes which discourage or inhibit interaction with out-group members. As such, it is possible to interpret some migrations as radical attempts to dissociate oneself from others. Of course, these types of migration are most often forced upon individuals or groups by overt persecution and/or government policy and thus the analysis of motivation can be usually directed at the sedentary body forcing the migration.

Analyses of social distance as a motivating factor for the free-choosing migrant are less common. One prominent, albeit inconclusive, body of literature is the discussion of 'white flight'. Given integration projects in the southern United States in the 1960's, many researchers explored the reactions of whites to forced contact with blacks. Accordingly, while it is somewhat unreasonable to suggest that the emigration of Anglophones from Quebec parallels 'white flight' in the southern U.S., both situa-

tions involve the problem of a forced contact between groups which had remained isolated for historical and some logical reasons.

According to Coleman (1975), U.S. data on school enrolments from 1968 to 1972 revealed that attempts to integrate urban schools were concurrent with the efforts of white parents to move to all-white school districts or, less commonly, to put their children in private schools. Levine and Meyer (1977) provide similar data indicating that white enrolment declined more rapidly if black enrolment stood over thirty per cent or showed a rapid increase. For the most part, however, this evidence has failed to provide convincing proof that white flight is related to contact. A number of researchers have shown no relationship between desegregation and white outward migration, or have found other variables to be more pertinent in explaining the migration (Farley, 1975; Jackson, 1975; Rossell, 1975; Green and Pettigrew, 1975; Wegman, 1976.) For example, Varady (1971) examined household migration decisions in a racially changing neighbourhood and concluded that when plans to move intensified over time, the major influence was not related to changing racial composition but more to changing household income.

For Anglophones in Quebec, avoidance of the 'other solitude' had not been problematic until the mid seventies. The tightened encapsulation of the group allowed for minimal interaction with Francophones. It was only with legislation concerning the French language in Quebec that the "white flight" hypothesis becomes interesting.

Conclusion

This chapter has summarized, in some detail, major findings in the migration literature and has emphasized the importance of the migrant as a rational individual. The idea of social distance as a determining factor in migration has also been introduced.

The object of the present research, to be discussed in the following chapters, will be to identify which of the variables, having previously been established in the literature as important, are found to be, in fact, important in predicting the propensity to migrate for our sample of Anglophones.

CHAPTER TWO

A SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF ANGLOPHONES IN QUEBEC

Introduction

....born of wealthy parents of English or Scottish origin on the slopes of Westmount, he attended private schools before entering McGill University, where he frattered away his undergraduate years in fraternity houses and at the Ritz; afterwards he toured the old country prior to assuming his rightful place behind his father's roll-top desk on St. James Street, where he devoted the rest of his life to screwing the French Canadians

(Desbarats, 1965)

While this description is outdated and exaggerated, the stereotype has been supported by hard data. Canadian researchers have consistently shown that both ethnic pluralism and linguistic dualism has had far-reaching effects on educational and occupational placement in this country (Porter, 1965; Blishen, 1970). Moreover, the question of discrepancies in educational, occupational, and income achievement between English- and French-speaking Quebecers has more or less dominated governmental and academic inquiries since the early 1960's.

In this chapter we provide a brief socio-economic profile of

Anglophones in Montreal in the late 1970's. Looking at education, occupation, and income, we shall compare achievement by ethnic background and age group within our sample. Some comparisons are made with Francophones.

2.1 Educational Achievement

Language Group Differences

Table 2.1 compares Bernard's data on educational attainment for Quebec Francophones and Non-Francophones with our Anglophone data.

Bernard's data indicate that differences in educational attainment are virtually non-existent at the high school level. Approximately 51.8 of Non-Francophones have eleven to twelve years of education as compared to 49.8 percent of Francophones. This gap is widened at the university level where only 10.2 percent of the Francophone sample as compared with 23.4 percent of Non-Francophones reported university education. The disparity between groups is even more pronounced when we contrast the educational attainment of Montreal Anglophones. In this instance the percentage difference between Francophones and Anglophones is 38.3 percent, with 48.5 percent of Montreal Anglophones reporting university education.

These findings do not necessarily point to such marked differences

in educational attainment. It is highly likely that the differences we see in Table 2.1 are differences in rural/urban populations. Since the study conducted by Bernard fails to distinguish between Montreal Francophones and rural Francophones, any comparisons with Montreal Anglophones are at best impressionistic. What we are able to say is that Montreal Anglophones, as a group, are rather highly educated.

Ethnic Differences (1)

While there do seem to exist clear differences in levels of educational achievement for Quebec's two major language groups, it is also possible to show that within the Anglophone minority, educational achievement is significantly different for respondents of different ethnic background. Table 2.2 shows that almost forty percent of our Jewish respondents hold university degrees, a finding consistent with national trends. As early as 1967, Raynauld, Marion and Beland reported that Jewish educational attainment exceeded national averages. Respondents who identified themselves simply as 'English Canadians' fall below the educational attainment of Jewish Canadians, with 31.7 percent reporting university education. Of those respondents claiming British origin, only 20.0 percent have university degrees while, of those claiming 'other' origins, 18.6 percent report such high educational attainment.

Age Differences

Table 2.3 shows that for our Anglophone sample, educational achievement is greatest for younger cohorts. Among respondents aged 18 to 24, educational attainment averages 13.3 years, although it should be noted that many of these respondents were still pursuing full-time studies at the time of interviewing. For respondents aged 25 to 34, the average length of education is 14.1 years. This compares with the oldest cohort aged 55 to 65 whose average educational attainment is 11.8 years.

Similarly, Table 2.4 reveals that, compared to the oldest age cohort, university degrees are held by more than twice the percentage of respondents aged 25 to 34 with almost forty-five percent of this group possessing university degrees. These differences in educational achievement can probably be explained by the fact that average educational achievement has risen over the past two generations. In addition, it is possible that in the Anglophone population we are seeing educational averages lowered by the Anglo-assimilation of immigrants who are overrepresented in the older age groups.

2.2 Occupational Achievement

Given the close association between educational attainment and occupational attainment, we would expect Montreal Anglophones to

rank fairly high in the latter category. Table 2.5 contrasts the national distribution of occupations with the distribution for our own particular sample population. It is clear from the table that Montreal Anglophones are overrepresented in upper white collar positions. While for both males and females the percentage of the population employed at the level of clerical, sales and services is the same for the total Canadian and Montreal Anglophone population, fifty percent of Anglophone males as compared to 17.3 percent of the Canadian population are found in upper white collar positions. Similarly, Anglophone males have only 20.2 percent of respondents engaged in crafts, trades and manual occupations as compared with 52.9 percent of the total Canadian population. Montreal Anglophone females are slightly overrepresented in white collar occupations/compared to national percentages, and slightly underrepresented in crafts, trades and manual occupations.

Language Group Differences

Turning to Table 2.6, we can compare the occupational position of Anglophones and Francophones in Quebec by contrasting Bernard's (1979) sample data with our own. The table indicates that for both males and females, occupational status is much higher for non-Francophones than Francophones and overwhelmingly higher for

Montreal Anglophones as compared with Francophones. Although this distribution shows clearly the continuing overrepresentation of Anglophones in high occupational positions, caution should be exercised when the differences between Francophones and non-Francophones are considered. Again, Bernard's data does not distinguish between urban and non-urban populations. Since 85.7 percent of non-Francophones live in Montreal, it is certain that some of the differences in occupational status may be attributed to rural versus urban characteristics. Table 2.6 also shows that there exist differences in occupational status for non-Francophones and our sample respondents. This may be explained by the greater ethnic heterogeneity of the non-Francophone sample which would include the recent immigrant population which has been excluded from the Anglophone sample.

Ethnic Differences

As shown in Table 2.7, when we differentiate our sample by ethnic background, our data again indicates that the Jewish ethnics have the highest percentage of respondents in upper white collar occupations, followed by English Canadians, British, and finally 'Other' ethnics.

Age Differences

Table 2.8 shows the occupational status of Anglophones by age

cohort. Respondents aged 18 to 24 are underrepresented in the higher occupational classes. This can be attributed largely to the fact that young adults with high status job skills do not always start out in the highest occupational classes. In general, it would seem that younger Anglophones are more likely to be employed in the highest status jobs than older Anglophones. However, as with educational achievement, we may be witnessing the effects of the Anglo-assimilation of immigrants in the older age groups. Respondents aged 35 to 44 are most likely to be found in high status occupations with 17.3 percent falling in Class I, followed by respondents aged 25 to 34 of whom 11.3 percent fall in Class I.

Occupational Mobility

A recent study on mobility reports that Canadian society is marked clearly by considerable upward and downward mobility (Goyder and Curtis, 1977). Moreover, these authors underline the importance of education in explaining occupational mobility. Other studies have shown that ethnicity and language have considerable effects on occupational status (Porter, 1965; Blishen, 1970). Native Anglophones as well as British immigrants have been advantaged since they identify easily with the group which maintains both political and economic control in the country. Subsequently, channels of mobility have been more readily accessible to them

than to other groups (Richmond, 1964; Porter, 1965).

It is appropriate to suppose that there will be considerably greater occupational mobility among Anglophones than among other groups.

Table 2.9 compares respondent's present occupation with father's last full-time occupation. Almost 60 percent of respondents whose fathers hold upper white collar jobs are also to be found in white collar jobs. Approximately 45 percent of respondents whose fathers are in clerical, sales or service occupations are employed in upper white collar jobs. Intergenerational mobility is most evident with respondents whose fathers are employed in blue collar occupations. One third have risen to upper white collar occupations while 49.2 percent are in clerical, sales or service occupations. Overall, there is little evidence of downward mobility.

Table 2.10 considers intragenerational mobility by comparing respondent's first occupation with respondent's present occupation. Mobility is greatest for respondents starting out in blue collar occupations. Approximately 40 percent remain in blue collar jobs while 24.2 percent have risen to upper white collar positions. Approximately 56 percent of respondents whose first jobs fall in the clerical, sales or services categories are still at that level, as compared to 31.3 percent who have gained upper white collar employment. Finally, 86 percent of those who began in upper white collar jobs have remained in those occupations.

2.3 Income

Language Group Differences

Disparities in income between Anglophones and Francophones in Quebec have been well documented. In 1961, the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission reported that the average income for men speaking English only was \$5,536.00 compared to \$3,246.00 for those speaking French only (Lieberson, S., 1970: 168). An unpublished report to the Commission demonstrated by means of a detailed analysis of 1961 census data that only thirty-three percent of the difference in income between English Canadian and French Canadian Montrealers was attributable to the lower education of French Canadians, while an additional six percent was due to different age structures. The authors contended that the remaining sixty percent was attributable to the clear preference of Anglophone employers for English Canadian job candidates. More recently, Boulet (1979) has compared inter-linguistic disparities and shown that among male workers from 1961 to 1977, the earnings disparity has dropped from a fifty-one percent difference to a fifteen percent difference.

Similarly, Bernard's 1978 data for Francophones and non-Francophones shows that 20.3 percent of non-Francophones, as compared with 11.9 percent of Francophones, earned declared incomes of over \$19,500.

Since our questionnaire included only the question of household income, comparisons with Bernard's data are prohibited. Nevertheless, Table 2.11 reveals that 51.4 percent of the Anglophones in our sample declared family incomes for 1977 at over \$20,000. Moreover, almost half of these same respondents reported incomes of over \$30,000.

Ethnic Differences (2)

When we investigate differences in household income controlling for ethnic background, we find that almost 50 percent of Jewish Anglophones declare annual incomes of over \$30,000. Twenty-five percent of English Canadians declare incomes over \$30,000, while 14 percent of British respondents and 14.3 percent of 'Other' ethnic respondents earn incomes above the \$30,000 mark.

Conclusions

In sum, the demographic decline of the Anglophone population does not seem to have affected the high socio-economic status of the group as a whole. There are clear indications that the gap between Francophones and Anglophones has been considerably narrowed. Clearly, Anglophones in Montreal are highly educated, hold high occupational positions, and earn high incomes. Furthermore, young

Anglophones are, on the average, better educated than older Anglophones. Some differences are encountered when we compare Anglophones by ethnic background. Jewish Anglophones display the highest levels of education, occupation, and income when compared with other Anglophones. It is also surprising to observe that Anglophones of British origin display significantly lower levels of achievement in all three categories in comparison with Jewish and English Canadian respondents. Less surprising is the fact that 'Other' ethnic Anglophones record the lowest levels of education, occupation, and income.

In closing this chapter it is important to note that any comparisons drawn between Anglophones and Francophones are legitimate only for the appreciation of overall status and not for arguments about discrimination and the like.

NOTES

1. Respondents were asked the following question: What is your ethnic origin? during the initial contact phase. For this chapter we have retained the original distinction made between 'English Canadian' and 'British'. Chapters Three, Four, Five, and Six distinguish between three major groups: Angloceltics, Jewish, and Other Ethnic.
2. The ethnic background of the respondent is somewhat unreliable as an independent variable since we are considering only household income. In some cases, the main income earner may not have the same ethnic background as the respondent.

TABLE 2.1

EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT FOR QUEBEC FRANCOPHONES,
NON-FRANCOPHONES (1), MONTREAL ANGLOPHONES

Level of education	(Bernard Sample) ²		(Montreal Anglophone Sample) ³
	Francophones	Non-Francophones	Montreal Anglophones
0 - 7 yrs.	17.1	11.3	5.4
8 - 10 yrs.	22.9	14.1	14.1
11 - 12 yrs.	49.8	51.3	32.0
university	10.2	23.4	48.5
TOTAL	(3173)	(626)	(332)

1. Paul Bernard et al. L'evolution de la situation socio-economic des Francophones et des non Francophones au Quebec (1971-1978), Office de la Langue Francaise, 1979, table 20B, p. 98.
2. Sample includes respondents age 17+ years.
3. Sample includes respondents aged 18-65 years.

TABLE 2.2

HIGHEST DEGREE RECEIVED BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Degree	Ethnic Background				N
	British	English Canadian	Jewish	Other	
Elementary	16.4	19.8	12.2	28.8	
Secondary	41.8	34.1	30.6	32.2	
Post-secondary	9.1	10.8	6.1	11.9	
Technical	12.7	3.6	12.2	8.5	
Bachelor MA, Ph.D, Dr.	20.0	31.7	38.8	18.6	
	100.0 (55)	100.0 (167)	100.0 (49)	100.0 (59)	330

chi-square 19.41341, 12df.
alpha = .07

TABLE 2.3

AVERAGE EDUCATION AMONG AGE GROUPS

AGE GROUP	YEARS OF EDUCATION $\bar{x}$	N
18 - 24	13.3	(66)
25 - 34	14.1	(83)
35 - 44	13.6	(78)
45 - 54	11.9	(62)
55 - 65	11.8	(42)
		331

TABLE 2.4
HIGHEST DEGREE RECEIVED BY AGE COHORT

DEGREE	AGE					N
	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-65	
Elementary	9.2	13.3	16.7	32.3	35.7	
Secondary	49.2	30.1	32.1	30.6	31.0	
Post-secondary (d.e.c.)	23.1	4.8	7.7	9.7	4.8	
Technical	--	7.2	7.7	12.9	9.5	
Bachelor MA, Ph.D, Dr.	18.5	44.6	35.9	14.5	19.0	
Totals (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
N	(65)	(83)	(78)	(62)	(42)	330

chi-square = 60.82700; df=16
alpha = .0000

TABLE 2.5

OCCUPATIONAL POSITION: COMPARISON OF MONTREAL
ANGLOPHONES WITH CANADIAN POPULATION (1971 census)

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	<u>Canadian Labour Force (1)</u>		<u>Montreal Anglophones (2)</u>	
	<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>
Upper White Collar	17.3	22.3	50.0	31.2
Clerical, Sales, Service	29.9	62.4	29.8	62.3
Crafts, Trade, Manual	52.9	15.3	20.2	6.5
			(114)	(77)

1. Pineo, et al. 'The 1971 Census and the SE Classification of Occupation', Major census groups aggregated into three categories: UIC (Major group, 33 and less), CSS (Major groups 41, 51, 61), CTM (Major group 71 and higher).

2. Anglophone sample data classified as above.

TABLE 2.6

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS FOR FRANCOPHONES, NON-FRANCOPHONES,¹ MONTREAL ANGLOPHONES, BY SEX, 1978

Blisshen Class	<u>Male</u>			<u>Female</u>		
	<u>Francophone</u>	<u>Non-Francophone</u>	<u>Montreal Anglophone</u>	<u>Francophone</u>	<u>Non-Francophone</u>	<u>Montreal Anglophone</u>
<u>1</u>	3.3	4.0	9.6	.6	1.9	10.4
<u>2</u>	13.2	25.1	43.0	12.9	16.3	19.5
<u>3</u>	12.0	16.5	13.2	22.5	26.4	36.4
<u>4</u>	20.8	19.8	18.4	33.5	31.6	18.2
<u>5</u>	29.1	22.0	6.1	9.8	12.0	6.5
<u>6</u>	21.6	12.5	9.6	20.7	11.9	9.1
N	(2100)	(418)	(114)	(1054)	(208)	(77)

1, Bernard et al. Table 29, p. 115.

TABLE 2.7
OCCUPATIONAL STATUS BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

	<u>British</u>	<u>English Canadian</u>	<u>Jewish</u>	<u>Other</u>
Upper White Collar	39.3	46.4	61.5	22.5
Clerical, sales, services	39.3	39.2	34.6	60.6
Crafts, trade, manual	21.4	14.4	3.8	17.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(28)	(97)	(26)	(40)

chi-square = 13.12, df=6,
alpha = .04

TABLE 2.8

BLISHEN CLASS CATEGORY BY AGE COHORT FOR ALL ANGLOPHONES

BLISHEN	AGE					N
	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-65	
Class I	3.3	11.3	17.3	5.3	5.9	
Class II	6.7	34.0	40.4	39.5	41.2	
Class III	33.3	22.6	15.4	21.1	29.4	
Class IV	36.7	17.0	13.5	15.8	11.8	
Class V	6.7	9.4	5.8	5.3	--	
Class VI	13.3	5.7	7.7	13.2	11.8	
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
N	(30)	(53)	(52)	(38)	(17)	190

TABLE 2.9

RESPONDENT'S PRESENT OCCUPATION COMPARED
WITH FATHER'S LAST FULL-TIME OCCUPATION

<u>Father's Occupation</u>	<u>Present Occupation</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>N</u>
	<u>Crafts, trade, manual</u>	<u>Clerical, sales, service</u>	<u>Upper white collar</u>		
Crafts, trade, manual	20.0	49.2	30.8	100.0	(65)
Clerical, sales, service	13.0	42.0	44.9	100.0	(69)
Upper White Collar	6.5	34.8	58.7	100.0	(46)
					N
					180

chi-square = 9.82358, df = 4,
alpha = .04
r = .2315, R² = .05

TABLE 2.10

RESPONDENT'S PRESENT OCCUPATION COMPARED
WITH RESPONDENT'S FIRST OCCUPATION

<u>Respondent's First Occupation</u>	<u>Respondent's Present Occupation</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>N</u>
	<u>Crafts, trade, manual</u>	<u>Clerical, sales, service</u>	<u>Upper white collar</u>		
Crafts, trade, manual	39.4	36.4	24.2	100.0	(33)
Clerical, sales, service	12.2	56.5	31.3	100.0	(115)
Upper White Collar	2.3	11.6	86.0	100.0	(43)
N					191

chi-square = 59.03221, df = 4,
alpha = .0000₂
r = .45311, R² = .2

TABLE 2.11
DECLARED HOUSEHOLD INCOME FOR 1977 MONTREAL ANGLOPHONES

<u>Income in dollars</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
30,000 +	74	24.7
20,000 - 29,000	80	26.7
10,000 - 19,000	96	32.0
Less than 10,000	50	16.6
TOTAL	300	100.0

TABLE 2.12
HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY RESPONDENT'S ETHNIC BACKGROUND

<u>Income in dollars</u>	<u>Ethnic Background</u>				
	<u>British</u>	<u>English Canadian</u>	<u>Jewish</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>N</u>
30,000 +	14.6	25.0	47.7	14.3	
20,000 - 29,000	35.4	26.3	27.3	19.6	
10,000 - 19,000	37.5	29.6	18.2	44.6	
Less than 10,000	12.5	19.1	6.8	21.4	
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
N	(48)	(152)	(44)	(56)	300

chi-square = 26.84711, df = 9
alpha = .001

CHAPTER THREE

THE ENCAPSULATION OF MONTREAL ANGLOPHONES

Introduction

The segregation of the English and French in Quebec is well documented in the 'two solitudes' literature. Hughes (1940), Ouellet (1964), Joy (1972), Clark (1976) and others have shown that a combination of social, political, economic and cultural factors have promoted the development of a segregated society of two language groups with analagous, more or less self-sufficient institutions. While the English/French dichotomy overlooks the heterogeneous character of the Anglophone minority, it seems reasonable to accept Barth's (1969) suggestion that less attention should be paid to cultural contrasts between ethnic groups and more attention focused on boundary maintenance since it is frequently only the "sense" of separateness which distinguishes ethnic groups.

In this chapter we examine the extent to which the Anglophones in our Montreal sample are 'socially distant' from Francophones. Social distance is measured attitudinally - using the standard Bogardus scale - and behaviourally - by considering actual con-

tact. We hypothesize that some of the variation in social distance responses can be understood by an examination of the following three attributes of the respondents:

- a. Age: Given the dynamics of change in Quebec, we should find that younger respondents will experience closer contacts with Francophones, and score lowest on the Bogardus scale.
- b. Education: As an indicator of socio-economic status, we expect that highly educated respondents will have the greatest amount of contact with Francophones and will score lowest on the Bogardus scale. Most of the literature reports a positive association between status and social interaction.
- c. Ethnic Background: We would expect that the more homogeneous the group the greater the social distance. Here homogeneous pertains to ethnic background and religion. Our data does not permit detailed analysis by ethnic background, thus we compare only Angloceltics, Jews, and Others. We expect that Jewish respondents will have fewest contacts with Francophones and score highest on the Bogardus scale.

3.1 The Setting

It seems reasonable to argue that identification with the Anglophone sector of Montreal comes not from any strong sense of British origin - since the origins of the community are so diverse - nor from historical circumstances or group persecution. Apart from a shared language, the most identifying mark of the Anglophone in Quebec would seem to be his almost exclusive use of

English language institutions. He reads English newspapers, uses English hospitals, frequents English businesses, lives in predominantly English-speaking neighbourhoods, and his children attend English schools. Indeed, Breton's concept of institutional "completeness" describes in adequate terms the Anglophone community in Montreal - i.e. the capacity of this community to perform all the services required by its members. Breton contends that this arrangement serves to keep the social relations of the community population within its boundaries and further tends to minimize the extent of out-group contacts. (Breton, 1964)

It is important to recognize that Montreal is the stronghold of this community since the city contains over eighty percent of all Quebec Anglophones in a metropolitan region that also holds almost one half of the total population of the province. Indeed, as Postgates and McRoberts (1976: 49, 50) explain: "Many of Canada's principal indigenously-controlled economic institutions - transportation, insurance, banking - have shaped the city's commercial life and via institutions like McGill have spread their influence to give the city a powerful and highly visible Anglophone milieu."

However, it must be noted that the status of the English in Quebec was changing even in the early 1970's. Government measures and Francophone attitudes had contributed to a greater emphasis on French. Many factors, including the emigration of head offices,

the closing of English schools, and a reduction in media representation have contributed to the decline of the relative importance of the English community. (1)

3.2 The Measurement of Social Distance

The measurement of group segregation has been most often linked with the concept of "social distance." Although this term can be traced to Park (1924) as that which intensifies racial consciousness, increases individual visibility, and makes individual identification with a particular ethnic unit more obvious, the concept is more commonly associated with the work of Emile Bogardus (1926).

More specifically, social distance has been measured using a scale devised by Bogardus to determine the differential social attraction patterns which are inferred to exist between groups. Persons are asked to rank various ethnic and racial groups according to a series of hypothetical social relationships ranging from intermarriage to citizenship in their country. The primary determinant of responses is seen generally as the degree of perceived similarity between the respondent and the stimulus person.

Lever (1968), Pettigrew and Payne (1969), and Kinloch (1974) have verified that the societal context rather than personality orientations are more important determinants of social distance attitudes. In this direction, several studies have demonstrated

that socio-economic status is negatively associated with social distance (Ellis, 1956; Bogardus, 1959; McDill, 1961; Beshers, 1963; Noel and Pinkney, 1969. Others have shown that race, religion, nationality, and political ideology may be determinants of social distance (Prothro, 1952; Fendrich, 1967; Defriese and Ford, 1969; Brown, 1969; Kinlock, 1974).

Finally, refinements of social distance measures have been attempted by combining various status dimensions to attach to the stimulus person - for example, class with race, or occupational position with ethnicity. This procedure tends to eliminate the problem of ethnic stereotyping in the evaluation of other groups and has usually managed to reduce acceptable distances between ethnic or racial groups of the same class. Finally, the scale enjoys a reputation in social science research so that it has been considered a valid indicator of the amount of potential or real conflict existing between cultural groups (Bonjean, 1965:533).

While the Bogardus scale may be a reliable measure of expected behaviour in a given social situation, it in no way indicates the extent to which an individual has contact with other groups. Discrepancies in attitudes and behaviour have been discussed and the very basic conclusion that has been reached is that attitudes

are not necessarily the best indicators of behaviour (Lapierre, 1934; Minard, 1952; Linn, 1969; Lange, Lipkin, Locher, 1979).

Many sophisticated techniques have been developed to determine the extent to which ethnic or racial groups are isolated from one another. A favourite indicator of group isolation is residential segregation. Although it is commonly held that ethnic segregation reflects socio-economic differences (Lieberson, 1970; Darroch and Marston, 1971; Richmond, 1973), the importance of ethnicity as an independent dimension has also been recognized in the theoretical framework of social area analysis. Numerous measures of segregation have been applied to Canadian and American census tracts revealing that ethnicity explains some of the variance in residence (Lieberson, 1970; Duncan, 1955; Darroch and Marston, 1971; Balakrishnan, 1976.)

In the Quebec context, evidence of extreme residential segregation has been collected by Joy (1972; 1978), while Lieberson (1970) and Balakrishnan (1976) have shown that Montreal, in comparison with all other Canadian cities, is the most ethnically segregated and further that this is increasing rather than following the trend towards desegregation prevalent in the rest of Canada. Foggin (1977) used factor analysis on census tracts for Montreal and found that ethnicity accounted for ten percent of the variance in residence.

Unfortunately, there is little in the way of any systematic, refined measurement of other variables which represent behavioural social distance. Nevertheless, the feasibility of this kind of research has been studied by Allport (1954). He suggests that areas of causal, occupational, and recreational contact be measured quantitatively by frequency and duration, distinguishing voluntary from involuntary types of interaction.

3.3. Language as Social Distance

The acquisition of a second language is a good index of the process of integration since it opens up new channels of influence and expresses the commitment of the individual to the process.

Studies on bilingualism among Quebec Anglophones have generally shown that language segregation is still a barrier to the social and cultural integration of French and English in Quebec. Gendron (1977) reported that Anglophones in general used little French. More specifically, this study considered the use of French in the Quebec labour force and discovered that, in all sectors of the labour market, at least seventy-five percent of employed Anglophones rarely or never used French on the job. More recently, a study of students enrolled in English language secondary schools and CEGEPs found that thirty-two percent of Angloceltic students were, on the basis of their own self-evaluations, observed to have low competence in French. Moreover, this study considered the use

of French in media activities (television, radio, movies, etc.) and it was found that, in all activities, just over 50 percent of English students used 'only English' (Locher, 1983).

From the distribution of responses shown in Table 3.1, it is clear that bilingualism is not the norm for Montreal Anglophones. Here we find that only 20.2 percent of Anglophones claim to speak French fluently while over 50 percent either experience difficulties or do not speak the language at all.

Similarly, Table 3.2 indicates quite clearly that the use of French is minimal in settings where the individual has control, i.e. while at home, with friends and in the media language. Here it was discovered that approximately 70 percent of the sample affirmed that language usage was exclusively English. This percentage is reduced substantially when we refer to settings where language choice is not necessarily decided on by the respondent. Only 37 percent of respondents claimed that they used only English in public places, while in the workplace it was learned that only 36.3 percent claimed only English.

Age and Knowledge of French

We hypothesized that young Anglophones would be more competent in French than older Anglophones given that the exposure to the French

language in English schools has increased dramatically over the course of the past decade. Moreover, we assumed that a majority of young Anglophones recognized that French was a necessary job skill for employment in Quebec.

Comparing age groups by their self-evaluated knowledge of French, we find some support for this hypothesis. Table 3.3 shows that among respondents aged 18 to 33 years, 24.1 percent claim they speak French fluently while only 9.2 percent state that they do not speak French at all (2). In the 34 to 39 age category, 19.0 percent claim to speak French fluently as compared to 10.3 percent who do not speak French. Finally, among those respondents in the 50 to 65 age bracket, only 14.7 percent were found to claim fluency in French while 21.3 percent said they spoke no French whatsoever.

Education and Knowledge of French

Turning briefly to the association of education with second language ability, Table 3.4 indicates only a low positive association. Since the ability to speak a second language is to some extent related to the amount of resources an individual has available to pursue adequate training, it had been expected that a stronger association between knowledge of French and educational background would be found. That our sample study produced

only a low association suggests the involvement of other factors. The most tenable hypothesis is that in Quebec, until very recently, high status positions - both occupational and social - provided the greatest insulation from francization. Thus motivation was low where resources were high.

Ethnic Background and Knowledge of French

Table 3.5 shows that when respondents are differentiated on the basis of ethnic background, respondents in the category labelled 'Others' are a little more likely to have mastered the French language when compared with the Angloceltic and Jewish respondents.

3.4 Attitudinal Social Distance: The Bogardus Scale

Our study replicated the traditional Bogardus scale with items ranging from "Willingness to marry a Francophone", as the most intense contact, to "Would accept as a co-worker", as the most informal (3). The response items conformed to the properties of the Guttman scale with a coefficient of reproducibility set at .92. Sixty-two percent of the respondents scored zero, in that for each level of contact the response was 'very willing'. The range of scale scores (Appendix A), summarized in Table 3.6, shows an extremely skewed distribution, with a very high percentage

of respondents falling in the 'low' social distance category.

This finding corresponds to other recent applications of the Bogardus scale in Canada. (Weinfeld, 1978).

As in Weinfeld's study, most of the variance in social distance attitudes resulted from responses to the question of ethnic intermarriage. Table 3.6 displays significant score differences when respondents are compared by their ethnic background. For Jewish respondents, 60.4 percent fall into the low social distance category compared with 88.2 percent in the case of Anglo-celtics. Clearly, the higher social distance shown by Jews reflects proscriptions against intermarriage with non-Jews. Since the 'Other' category is a residual one, it is difficult to comment on the percentage of respondents scoring high or moderate social distance.

No significant differences in social distance were found when respondents were differentiated on the basis of age or education.

3.5 Behavioural Social Distance: Contact with Francophones

To determine the extent to which the Anglophone population actually interacts with Francophones, we looked at contact on four different levels: intermarriage, friends, neighbours, and co-workers. Respondents were asked to provide the ethnic background

of spouse, three friends, two immediate neighbours, and five co-workers. For each level of contact except spouse, the number of francophone contacts were tallied. Table 3.7 gives zero order correlations between levels of contact, showing low but significant association between types of contact. To further investigate the relationship between these variables, a Guttman scale was attempted by ordering the items in a Bogardus-type direction. This test failed to produce an acceptable coefficient of reproducibility (4).

Family Contacts

Evidence of a firmly-structured Anglophone family is clear when we consider that only 6.3 percent of our respondents have a father whose mother tongue is French, and only 4.8 percent have a francophone mother. Continuity for in-group intermarriage is shown in Table 3.8 where, similarly, only 10.1 percent of married respondents have spouses whose mother tongue is French. When we examine spouses' mother tongue by age group in Table 3.9, it is found that the younger Anglophones are only slightly more likely to have a French spouse, even though this table is not statistically significant. No differences are found when we control for educational background.

Table 3.10 permits us to assess differences with respect to ethnic background and here we see that 14.1 percent of Angloceltics

are married to Francophones as compared to 4.3 percent of those in the 'others' category. None of our Jewish respondents are married to Francophones. Though the absolute numbers are small, there seems to be sufficient evidence to suggest that religious proscriptions against intermarriage with non-Jews is a strong deterrent to intermarriage between Jews and Francophones.

Friendship Associations

In studying friendship associations, the findings given in Table 3.11 reveal that only a small percentage of Anglophones have Francophone friends. Asked to give the ethnic background of three close friends, 62.2 percent of our respondents listed no francophone friends, while 30.6 percent had one and only 7.2 percent have two francophone friends out of three.

Table 3.12 summarizes differences in friendship contacts by age group, level of education, and ethnic background. Looking at age differences and this type of contact, it is found that, although there is no statistically significant difference between means, older Anglophones are slightly more likely to have francophone friends than are younger Anglophones. In terms of educational background, those in the lowest educational category are a little more likely to have francophone friends than are those

in the higher educational category. Still, for both age and education, the friendship score is in general so low that differences are not particularly interesting.

Perhaps more interesting is the comparison between Anglophone ethnics. It can be seen clearly that the average score of .22 for Jewish respondents is substantially lower than the average of .53 for the Anglocelts and the .35 score for 'Others'. This finding is, of course, consistent with the other high social distance behaviour exhibited by the Jewish respondents.

Neighbours

In view of the fact that research in the area of residential segregation has become so sophisticated, this study did not attempt to classify respondents by the census ethnic tracts in which they lived. Rather, this study was interested in whether immediate neighbours were English- or French-speaking as there was likely to be at least minimal formal contact. Of course, this variable of contact is the least satisfying of all our social distance measures since association with one's neighbour ranges from total avoidance to close friendship and is likely to be influenced by the type of residence as well as by other factors.

In Table 3.13, it can be seen that almost forty-five percent of the sample have no francophone neighbours, while 34.3 percent have one francophone neighbour and 20.3 percent list two francophone neighbours.

Table 3.14 reveals that differences in neighbourhood contact with respect to age and educational background are not significantly different to warrant discussion. Contrasts by ethnic background are consistent with our previous findings. Once again, Jewish respondents score very low on neighbourhood contact with a mean of .19. This compares with a mean score of .86 for Angloceltics and .74 for 'Other' ethnics.

Co-workers

Since the drive for francization had been predominantly directed at changing the workplace in Quebec, and as the francophone middle class has grown tremendously during the past twenty years, it was anticipated that Anglophone respondents would have many more contacts with Francophones as co-workers. To measure this type of interaction, respondents were asked to name five of their co-workers, specifying ethnic origin.

Surprisingly, Table 3.15 indicates that almost thirty percent of

the sample reported no Francophone co-workers. Another 33.5 percent stated that they have one Francophone co-worker while only 5.2 percent said they had five Francophone co-workers.

In Table 3.16, means by age, education, and ethnic background were compared. It was found that there were no significant differences in contact for age groups. Controlling for education, it was learned that respondents possessing less than high school education report an average of 2.18 francophone co-workers as compared to respondents with post-secondary education who show an average of 1.2 francophone co-workers.

Jewish respondents again have fewer francophone contacts at work, reporting an average of .71. Meanwhile, Angloceltics scored an average of 1.8 and 'Other' ethnics scored 1.4.

Conclusions

Despite the limitations of the social distance data, a clear picture emerges of an encapsulated Anglophone community. In spite of the fact that the results from the Bogardus social distance scale indicate that, attitudinally, contact with all levels of intimacy are acceptable (5), evidence from our measures of actual contact point clearly to strong preferences for Anglophone

associations. In general, contacts with the francophone majority are limited in both personal and formal types of contact. Furthermore, more than sixty percent of the sample claimed low competence in the use of French.

The generally low level of contact for all respondents tends to obscure internal socio-demographic differences but they still do provide us with some impressionistic results. First, ethnic behaviour does seem important. At all levels of contact, Jewish respondents had fewest contacts with francophones, suggesting that persons with strong in-group affiliations are less likely to integrate themselves into an out-group milieu than are individuals who do not see themselves as members of a distinct minority. Our findings here support Weinfeld's study of the Montreal Jewish population (Weinfeld, 1979).

Secondly, differences in social distance with respect to educational status indicate that respondents with lowest educational status tend to have more contacts with francophones than do our respondents with high educational status. It can be supposed that this may be a structural phenomenon rather than a reflection of social psychological attitudes, given that the educational-occupational hierarchy in Quebec has for so long mirrored the linguistic hierarchy.

Finally, we have found no significant differences in contact with francophones by age group. This is surprising insofar as it was expected that young Anglophones would have had greater opportunity and felt an increased incentive to improve their competence in the French language and attempt to integrate themselves into the francophone milieu. That this clearly has not occurred suggests that Quebec Anglophones may consider migration as a viable option. This topic is discussed in Chapter Five.

NOTES

1. While the English language media may have sensationalized the effect of these factors on the English community, unsolicited comments from a majority of Anglophones in our sample suggested that this change in status was strongly felt and noted.
2. Caldwell's study of English mother-tongue high school graduates similarly found that twenty-three percent of sub-respondents were fluent in the French language. Locher (1983) found that among students of Angloceltic origin in high school and CEGEP, only 10.1 percent scored high competence in French. In this case, a more complex scheme of self-evaluated language proficiency was used.
3. See Appendix A for item frequencies and scale construction.
4. It is clear that behavioural social distance is much more complex than attitudinal social distance. Being married to a French-Canadian does not mean that one will have French-Canadian friends and neighbours, as Table 3.7 indicates.
5. The finding that attitudinal distance and behaviour social distance were inconsistent has already been discussed in some detail in another paper (Lange, Lipkin, Locher, 1979). It was concluded in this study that if one measures attitudes on a different level, they become more consistent with actual behaviour.

TABLE 3.1

SELF-RATED PROFICIENCY IN FRENCH
MONTREAL ANGLOPHONES

<u>Level of Proficiency</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Fluently	67	20.2
Nearly Fluently	67	20.2
With Some Difficulty	86	25.9
With Great Difficulty	71	21.4
Not At All	41	12.3
TOTAL	332	100.0

TABLE 3.2
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS USING ONLY ENGLISH IN
VARIOUS SETTINGS

<u>Language Use</u>	<u>English Only</u>		<u>Total N</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
Language used at Home	242	72.9	(332)
Language used with Friends	227	66.9	(332)
Language of Media	263	79.2	(332)
Language used in Public Place	123	37.0	(332)
Language of Work	69	36.3	(190)

TABLE 3.3

SELF-RATED PROFICIENCY IN FRENCH BY AGE GROUP

<u>Level of Proficiency</u>	<u>18-33</u>	<u>34-49</u>	<u>50-65</u>	<u>Total</u>
Fluently	24.1	19.0	14.7	(67)
Nearly Fluently	24.1	18.1	16.0	(67)
Some Difficulty	24.1	30.2	22.7	(86)
Lot of Difficulty	18.4	22.4	25.3	(71)
Not At All	9.2	10.3	21.3	(41)
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	
N	(141)	(116)	(75)	(332)

chi-square = 13.14103, df = 8,

alpha = .1071, gamma = .199

TABLE 3.4

SELF-RATED PROFICIENCY IN FRENCH BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Level of Proficiency	Level of Education		
	Less than High School	High School	Post-Sec.
Fluently	18.5	19.4	21.7
Nearly Fluently	20.0	17.8	22.5
Some Difficulty	16.9	23.3	32.6
Lot of Difficulty	24.6	26.4	15.2
Not At All	20.0	13.2	8.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(65)	(129)	(138)

chi-square = 15.33866, df = 8,
alpha = .05, gamma = -.16

TABLE 3.5

SELF-RATED PROFICIENCY IN FRENCH BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Level of Proficiency	Ethnic Background		
	Angloceltic ¹	Jewish	Other
Fluently	18.5	18.4	25.9
Nearly Fluently	18.5	24.5	22.2
With Some Difficulty	25.7	28.6	25.9
With Great Difficulty	22.5	24.5	16.7
Not At All	14.9	4.1	9.3
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(222)	(49)	(54)

chi-square = ns

¹ Angloceltic includes: Americans, British, Irish, Scottish.

TABLE 3.6

BOGARDUS SOCIAL DISTANCE FOR MONTREAL ANGLOPHONES,
TOTAL, AND BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

<u>Social distance Score *</u>	<u>Ethnic Background</u>			
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Angloceltic</u>	<u>Jewish</u>	<u>Other</u>
High ^{1.}	.9	--	4.2	1.7
Moderate	17.6	11.8	35.4	23.7
Low	81.1	88.2	60.4	74.6
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(323)	(142)	(29)	(44)

alpha = .000

* See Appendix I for social distance score scale and categorization.

1. While a dichotomy would have provided a more meaningful distribution, the small number of people falling in this high category suggests that their responses may have been related to other cultural or religious proscriptions not common to the majority of respondents and outside of this study's area of interest.

TABLE 3.7

CONTACT VARIABLES: MARRIAGE, FRIENDS, NEIGHBOURS,
CO-WORKERS: SIGNIFICANT ZERO ORDER CORRELATIONS

<u>Variable</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
1. Marriage	---	ns	ns	ns
2. Friends		---	.16*	.23*
3. Neighbours			---	.16*
4. Co-workers				---

* (p = .005)

TABLE 3.8

SPOUSE'S MOTHER TONGUE (MARRIED RESPONDENTS) (N = 199)

<u>Mother Tongue of Husband/Wife</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
English	72.9	(145)
French	10.1	(20)
English/French	2.5	(5)
Other	14.5	(29)
TOTAL	100.0	100.0

TABLE 3.9
SPOUSE'S MOTHER TONGUE¹ BY AGE GROUP

	<u>18 - 34</u>	<u>35 - 49</u>	<u>50 - 65</u>
English	71.9	75.0	77.4
French	14.0	8.3	9.4
Other	14.0	16.7	13.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(57)	(84)	(53) (194)

chi-square, ns.

¹ Respondents (N=5) stating spouses' mt, as 'English and French' are excluded from this table.

TABLE 3.10

SPOUSE'S MOTHER TONGUE BY RESPONDENT ETHNIC BACKGROUND

	<u>Angloceltic</u>	<u>Jewish</u>	<u>Other</u>
English	74.1	78.8	73.9
French	14.1	--	4.3
Other	11.9	21.2	21.7
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(135)	(33)	(23)

chi-square, ns.

TABLE 3.11

NUMBER OF FRANCOPHONE FRIENDS DECLARED BY RESPONDENT
(out of three)

	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
None	62.2	(199)
One	30.6	(98)
Two	5.3	(17)
Three	1.9	(6)
TOTAL	100.0	(320)

TABLE 3.12
FRIENDSHIP ASSOCIATIONS BY AGE, EDUCATION, ETHNIC BACKGROUND
(MEAN SCORES)¹

	$\bar{X}$	sd	N	F-Test Significance
TOTAL	.4688	.6850	(320)	
Age 18-34	.3926	.6590	(135)	
35-49	.4737	.6811	(114)	no
50-65	.6056	.7266	(71)	
<u>Education</u>				
Less than High School	.6441	.7836	(59)	
High School	.4297	.6482	(128)	yes
Post-Secondary	.4286	.6661	(133)	
<u>Ethnic Background</u>				
Angloceltic	.5346	.7071	(217)	
Jewish	.2222	.4714	(45)	yes
Other	.3529	.5941	(51)	

¹ Highest possible mean is 3.0; respondent was asked to name ethnic background of three close friends.

TABLE 3.13
FRANCOPHONE NEXT-DOOR NEIGHBOURS (2 Households)

	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
None	44.9	(142)
One	34.8	(110)
Two	20.3	(64)
TOTAL	100.0	(316)

TABLE 3.14

FRANCOPHONE NEIGHBOURS BY AGE, EDUCATION, ETHNIC BACKGROUND
(MEAN SCORES)

	<u>$\bar{X}$</u>	<u>sd</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>F-Test</u> <u>Significance</u>
TOTAL	.7532	.7700	316	
<u>Age</u> 18-34	.7576	.7629	132	
35-49	.7982	.8112	114	yes
50-65	.6714	.7167	70	
<u>Education</u>				
Less than High School	.7903	.8325	62	
High School	.7851	.7439	121	yes
Post-Secondary	.7068	.7666	133	
<u>Ethnic Background</u>				
Angloceltic	.8638	.7802	213	
Jewish	.1915	.4491	47	yes
Other	.7400	.7231	50	

TABLE 3.15

FRANCOPHONE CO-WORKERS (Out of Five)

	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
None	29.5	(51)
One	33.5	(58)
Two	15.0	(26)
Three	9.8	(17)
Four	6.9	(12)
Five	5.2	(9)
TOTAL	100.0	173

TABLE 3.16
FRANCOPHONE CO-WORKERS BY AGE, EDUCATION, ETHNIC BACKGROUND
(MEAN SCORES)¹

	<u>$\bar{X}$</u>	<u>sd</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>F-Test</u> <u>Significance</u>
TOTAL	1.4682	1.4449	(173)	
<u>Age</u>				
18-34	1.4085	1.4400	(71)	no
35-49	1.4521	1.5460	(73)	
50-65	1.6552	1.2034	(29)	
<u>Education</u>				
Less than High School	2.1818	1.7081	(22)	yes
High School	1.4938	1.4241	(81)	
Post-Secondary	1.2143	1.3176	(70)	
<u>Ethnic Background</u>				
Angloceltic	1.4746	1.4125	(118)	yes
Jewish	.7143	.7838	(21)	
Other	1.8148	1.7329	(29)	

¹ Highest possible mean is 5.0; respondent was asked to name ethnic background of five co-workers.

CHAPTER FOUR

INTENTIONS TO LEAVE QUEBEC

Introduction

From our review in Chapter One we know that certain socio-economic and demographic attributes usually distinguish migrants from non-migrants. In this chapter we look at the migration intentions of respondents with respect to age and life-cycle, education, occupation and income. In doing so, we address indirectly the question of motivations for leaving Quebec. If it is found that migration intentions are not randomly associated with traditional migrant attributes then there is important evidence to support our hypothesis that Anglophone migration intentions do not fall within the realm of 'normal' internal population movement (1). Finally, there will be a discussion of findings relating to our respondents' stated motivations for leaving Quebec.

4.1 The Propensity to Migrate as a Dependent Variable

Since a longitudinal migration study was not possible, a measure of moving intentions was employed so as to be able to differentiate migrants from non-migrants. Leslie and Richardson (1961),

Rossi (1955), Van Ardesol et al. (1968), Speare (1974), and Miller (1976) have maintained that reported moving intentions are reliable indicators of subsequent behaviour.

Accordingly, potential migrants were identified as those respondents declaring an intention, "definite" or "probable", to leave Quebec within five years from the time of the interview. Respondents were considered unlikely to be migrants if they stated that they would "definitely not" or "probably not" leave Quebec in a five year future.

4.2 Magnitude of the Movement

Of the three hundred and thirty-two respondents, only eighteen individuals had immediate plans to leave Quebec. These respondents had found new jobs and/or arranged for living accommodations outside of Quebec. Table 4.1 compares immediate plans to leave Quebec with intentions to migrate before 1983. When respondents were asked to state migration intentions for a five year future, 13.4 percent said that they would 'definitely' be leaving Quebec, and 26.8 percent said that they would 'probably' leave. Among these respondents, approximately sixteen percent of the sample had already made tentative or definite arrangements to leave Quebec in terms of finding a job or arranging accommodations.

4.3 Age and Lifecycle

In our earlier discussion of migrant selectivity we emphasized the importance of age as a determinant of migratory tendencies. We hypothesized that young Anglophones would be much more likely to state intentions to leave Quebec than older Quebecers.

Gary Caldwell, in a study of the migration intentions of English mother-tongue students from Quebec leaving high school (1971-76), found that thirty-three percent of those who left in the 1970-71 school year were no longer in Quebec as of November 1976. This figure represented at least a fifty percent increase in out-migration for this age group. Caldwell also observed that out-migration was higher from remote areas. Finally, for those remaining in Quebec, Caldwell found that nineteen percent had migration intentions. Similarly, in a more recent study of secondary and CEGEP students in the English sector in Quebec, Locher (1983) showed that 41.1 percent of English mother-tongue students were intending on pursuing their plans outside Quebec.

With respect to our sample of Montreal Anglophones, Table 4-2 shows a clear linear relationship between age and migration. Of those respondents aged 18 to 24, 27.1 percent stated that they would definitely be leaving Quebec within five years. This especially

contrasts with the 5.4 percent of respondents age 50 to 65 who had definite plans to leave the province.

When we group our respondents according to stage in lifecycle based on age, marital status, and children, we do not really learn more than age tells us alone. Table 4-3 shows intentions to migrate for selected ranges of lifecycle. Approximately twenty-three percent of the sample respondents were aged 18 to 33, single, with no children. Among these respondents, 26.5 percent said that they would definitely leave Quebec, while 30.9 percent said they would probably leave. Only nine percent of the respondents aged 34 to 49, married with children, reported that they had definite plans to leave, while 25.4 percent stated they would probably leave. Among those in the 50 to 65 age bracket, married with children, only 6.7 percent said they would definitely leave while 17.8 percent expressed the view that they would probably leave the province.

In sum, it can be stated that at least with respect to age, migratory selection for Montreal Anglophones follows the traditional pattern. Those most mobile, the young and single with no children, are much more likely to have intentions of leaving Quebec than those Anglophones at a more mature lifecycle stage.

4.4 Socio-Economic Status Selectivity

From previous research on internal migration in Canada, we have come to expect that socio-economic status is positively associated with the propensity to migrate. We hypothesized that Anglophones with the highest levels of education, occupation, and income would be more likely to have intentions to leave Quebec than Anglophones with the lowest levels of these attributes.

Table 4.4 presents migration intentions by respondents' educational attainment, and shows virtually no association between education and intention to leave Quebec; although the expected traditional association is seen if we consider the extreme categories of 'definitely leaving' and 'definitely not leaving'. Fifteen percent of respondents with post-secondary education state that they will 'definitely leave' Quebec, while only 9.3 percent of those with less than high school education report the same intention. Conversely, 38.9 percent of the latter group state that they will definitely not leave the province, compared with only 15.7 percent of respondents in the highest educational category.

In Table 4.5, no clear picture emerges when we examine the relationship between occupational status and migration intentions.

In this instance, the expected association between occupational status and migration intention is not in evidence. The gamma of .02

reveals no association between the two components. Of course, it is necessary to consider the fact that our numbers are significantly reduced and we have not controlled for age or sex.

Similarly, when we cross-tabulate migration intentions by categories of household income (see Table A.6), there is no support for the hypothesized relationship. Indeed, here it is found that there is a negligible negative association between income and migration when we consider that among respondents with household incomes under \$10,000 57.5% had probable or definite migration plans compared with only 30.4% of those respondents in households having \$30,000 or more (2).

These findings are clues to the weakness inherent in this type of migration analysis. In most cases, relatively little attention has been focused on the relationship between demographic subgroups and objective and attitudinal variables and how they vary with migration. It is clear that one should not look at socioeconomic variables without controlling for age. For example, an aging married executive in a secure position will under most circumstances not be as eager to uproot his household for a better position as the case may be with a young executive without a family to consider.

Controlling for Age

Given the limitations (3) of our data, we must restrict ourselves to consider only the relationship between education (4) and

migration, controlling for age. Table 4.7 confirms that positive selection with respect to educational achievement varies substantially by age group especially if we consider the extreme categories of "definitely leaving" and "definitely not leaving". For respondents aged 18 to 34, twenty-five percent of those with post-secondary education will definitely leave Quebec in the next five years as compared to the 7.7 percent portion of those with less than ten years of school. For respondents aged 34 to 49, this difference narrows. (Indeed, the direction of the association is negative suggesting that the educational variable may be most relevant among younger migrants.) For those with post-secondary education, 6.1 percent report definite plans to leave the province in comparison with 17.6 percent of those respondents with less than high school education. Finally, the comparison of young with old is most revealing. Educational achievements for respondents between the 50 to 65 age category account for only one percentage point between those with lowest and highest levels of education (5).

4.5 Stated Motivations for Leaving Quebec

Respondents were provided with a list of reasons why a person might leave Quebec and were asked to rank the personal importance of each reason. Table 4.8 shows the distribution of responses for first, second and third choices. More than forty percent of respondents stated that 'personal economic situation or job'

was the most important reason for wanting to leave Quebec. Twenty-one percent chose 'general political conditions' while 18.6 percent believed that 'language laws' were a prime motivating factor for leaving the province. Only 6.8 percent selected 'family and friends living elsewhere' as a first choice. Taken by frequency of response, 72.8 percent of respondents chose 'general political conditions' as a major reason for leaving Quebec. Seventy-one percent selected 'personal economic situation', and 70.6 percent chose 'general economic conditions'.

To learn whether motivations varied between age groups, we examined the prime motivation given for each age category. For the three age groups shown in Table 4.6, the importance of economic and political situation is similar. For those aged 50 to 65, a comparatively higher percentage chose 'family and friends elsewhere' as a first reason for migrating. This is not entirely surprising given that this age group is near retirement and seemingly more detached from economic and political events affecting their status.

4.7 Motivations and Migration Intentions

When we look at motivations to leave Quebec by intentions, it can be observed that among respondents who say that they are 'defi-

nitely leaving', 47.7 percent report that their primary motivation is 'personal economic situation'. At the same time, 23.7 percent of respondents stated that 'language laws' were the primary factor motivating them to wish to leave Quebec. Only 2.6 percent are motivated by 'general economic conditions', while 21.1 percent are motivated to leave in response to 'general political conditions'. 'Family ties' outside of Quebec was the primary motivation for 5.3 percent of respondents.

In the case of respondents who say that they will 'probably leave' Quebec and those who state that they will 'probably not leave', motivating factors are similar. However, when we compare respondents who say that they will 'definitely not leave' Quebec with all others, we find different motivations. Only 7.8 percent report that they would be motivated primarily by 'language laws', while 35.9 percent state that they would be motivated by their 'personal economic situation'.

Compared to all others, this group seems much more likely to express more vague motivating reasons for wishing to leave Quebec. For example, 29.7 percent said that 'general political conditions' would be a prime motivating force, while 15.6 percent reported that 'general economic conditions' would be the prime factor behind leaving. Finally, 10.9 percent among this group stated that 'friends and relatives' outside of Quebec was

the most important motivation for leaving the province.

The most significant finding in Table 4.10 is the comparison of respondents who say that they are definitely leaving with those who state they will definitely not leave. In particular, the fact that 23.7 percent of the former group (compared to only 7.8 percent of the latter group) chose 'language laws' as a main reason for wanting to leave Quebec suggests that, in this study, variables other than traditional migrant attributes are important to consider.

Conclusions

It is clear that the major variable explaining migration intentions is the age of the respondent. From our examination of the data, no other migrant characteristic was found to be significant. Positive selection with respect to education was found only when age of respondent was controlled. In terms of stated motivations for migrating, the vast majority of respondents chose economic factors. Still, a substantial number did mention language legislation and general political reasons as principal motivating factors.

In sum, we cannot state definitively that migrant selectivity and migrant motivations for our sample of Anglophones are outside the realm of what is expected in normal population movement.

We can say that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that 'social distance' variables may be important for a number of respondents. This is the area we shall explore in Chapter Five.

NOTES

1. Here we are assuming that people of a similar age and economic status are affected similarly by the francization campaign of Quebec. This may or may not be true and is discussed in Chapters Three and Five.
2. Income variable is problematic given its natural association with age.
3. Occupation includes only working respondents, thus our sample size is reduced substantially. The income variable referred to household income.
4. The education variable has been recoded to consider those who are still continuing education.
5. For young persons who have not yet established careers, education is a passport to a career elsewhere. For middle aged people, education has probably already served to help establish a successful career and thus restrains movement. Finally, for older people, occupational considerations are minimal and thus the importance of education is substantially reduced. Here too, it is important to acknowledge that for this older group, success is less likely to be related to education.

TABLE 4.1
INTENTIONS TO LEAVE QUEBEC, IMMEDIATE (1978)
AND FUTURE PLANS (1978-82)

Immediate Plans ^{1.} (1978)		Future Plans ^{2.} (1978-82)	
Definitely leaving	5.5	Definitively leaving	13.4
Tentatively leaving	10.9	Probably leaving	26.8
No plans	83.6	Probably not leaving	36.8
		Definitely not leaving	23.0
TOTAL 100.0		100.0	
N (332)		(291)	

1. Respondents were asked whether they had made definite plans in terms of securing a job outside of Quebec, or arranged accommodation or both. Tentative plans referred to having looked for a job or accommodations outside of Quebec.

2. Future Plans, Q205 in the Questionnaire.

NOTE: Percentages exclude the 41 respondents who said they "did not know" or refused to answer.

TABLE 4.2
CHANCES OF LEAVING QUEBEC IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS
BY RESPONDENTS' AGE GROUP

	age group (yrs.)				
	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-65
Chances of leaving (%)	(N = 291)				
Definitely leaving	27.1	14.5	13.2	2.0	5.4
Probably leaving	30.5	30.3	27.9	25.5	13.5
Probably not leaving	33.9	38.2	41.2	35.3	32.4
Definitely not leaving	8.5	17.1	17.6	37.3	48.6
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(59)	(76)	(68)	(51)	(37)

chi-square = 41.4641, df = 12

alpha = .0000

TABLE 4.3
CHANCES OF LEAVING QUEBEC BY
RESPONDENT'S STAGE IN LIFECYCLE (SELECTED GROUPS)

Chances of leaving (%)	lifecycle*		
	18-33 Single	34-49 Married, Children	50-65 Married, Children
Definitely leaving	26.5	9.0	6.7
Probably leaving	30.9	25.4	17.8
Probably not leaving	32.4	44.8	40.0
Definitely not leaving	10.3	20.9	35.6
TOTAL %	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(68)	(67)	(45)
% of total sample	23.4	23.0	15.5

* selected groups

TABLE 4.4
CHANCES OF LEAVING QUEBEC BY RESPONDENT'S EDUCATION

Chances of leaving %	education		
	0-10 yrs. less than high school	11-13 yrs. high school	14 yrs.+ Post-secondary
Definitively leaving	9.3	13.6	15.0
Probably leaving	31.5	25.5	26.0
Probably not leaving	20.4	37.3	43.3
Definitively not leaving	38.9	23.6	15.7
TOTAL %	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(54)	(110)	(127)

chi-square = 15.74810, df = 6

alpha = .01, gamma = -.13

TABLE 4.5
CHANCES OF LEAVING QUEBEC BY
RESPONDENT'S OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

Chances of leaving	Blishen Class*					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
	(N = 168)					
Definitely leaving	5.6	12.7	10.0	12.5	18.2	16.7
Probably leaving	22.2	34.5	22.5	28.1	36.4	33.3
Probably not leaving	50.0	32.7	45.0	31.3	27.3	25.0
Definitely not leaving	22.2	20.0	22.5	28.1	18.2	25.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(18)	(55)	(40)	(32)	(11)	(12)

chi-square = 6.6705, df = 15

alpha = .9, gamma = -.02

*Blishen, Bernard R.

1967 "A socio-economic index for occupation in Canada".
Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology IV: 41-53.

TABLE 4.6

CHANCES OF LEAVING QUEBEC BY
RESPONDENT'S HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Chances of leaving	Income			
	less than \$10,000	\$10,000- \$19,000	\$20,000- \$29,999	\$30,000 or more
(N = 265)				
Definitely leaving	25.0	11.6	12.9	11.6
Probably leaving	32.5	25.6	28.6	18.8
Probably not leaving	22.5	37.2	40.0	44.9
Definitely not leaving	20.0	25.6	18.6	24.6
TOTAL %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(40)	(86)	(70)	(69)

chi-square = 10.96839, df = 3

alpha = .2779

TABLE 4.7

INTENTIONS TO LEAVE QUEBEC BY EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT, CONTROLLING FOR AGE

Chances of leaving (%)	Education								
	18-34 yrs. (N = 126)			35 - 49 yrs. (N = 101)			50 - 65 yrs. (N = 64)		
	less than high school	high school	Post-Secondary	less than high school	high school	Post-Secondary	less than high school	high school	Post-Secondary
Definitely leaving	7.7	18.9	25.0	17.6	11.4	6.1	4.2	4.5	5.6
Probably leaving	38.5	32.1	30.0	35.3	22.9	26.5	25.0	13.6	11.1
Probably not leaving	15.4	37.7	35.0	23.5	40.0	51.0	20.8	31.8	50.0
Definitely not leaving	38.5	11.3	10.0	23.5	25.7	16.3	50.0	50.0	33.3
TOTAL %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(13)	(53)	(60)	(17)	(35)	(49)	(24)	(22)	(18)
chi-square = ns gamma = -.17172			chi-square = ns gamma = .06			chi-square = ns gamma = -.059			

TABLE 4.8

STATED MOTIVATIONS FOR LEAVING QUEBEC

Motivation for leaving Quebec	First reason given	Second reason given	Third reason given	% of total
Personal economic situation	44.8	14.2	12.7	71.7
General economic situation	9.8	16.6	34.1	70.6
Language laws	18.6	19.8	18.0	56.4
General political situation	21.1	28.5	23.2	72.8
Friends and relatives outside Quebec	6.8	7.7	5.6	20.1
TOTAL %	100.0	100.0	100.0	
N	(322)	(322)	(322)	

TABLE 4.9

PRIME MOTIVATION FOR WANTING TO LEAVE QUEBEC BY AGE GROUP

Motivation for leaving Quebec (%)	Age group		
	18 - 33 yrs.	34 - 49 yrs.	50 - 65 yrs.
Personal economic situation or job	46.0	53.6	26.0
General economic conditions	10.2	5.4	15.1
Language laws	21.9	15.2	16.4
General political conditions	19.0	20.5	26.0
Friends and relatives outside Quebec	2.9	5.4	16.4
TOTAL %	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(137)	(112)	(73)

chi-square = 28.34668, df = 8,
alpha = .000

TABLE 4.10
STATED MOTIVATION FOR WANTING TO LEAVE QUEBEC
BY INTENTION TO LEAVE QUEBEC

Motivation	Chances of leaving			
	Definitely	Probably	Probably Not	Definitely Not
	(N = 283)			
Personal economic situation	47.4	44.7	45.7	35.9
General economic conditions	2.6	11.8	6.7	15.6
Language laws	23.7	22.4	19.0	17.8
General political conditions	21.1	17.1	21.9	29.7
Friends and relatives outside of Quebec	5.3	3.9	6.7	10.9
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(38)	(76)	(105)	(64)

chi-square = 17.279, df = 12
alpha = ns.

CHAPTER FIVE

SOCIAL DISTANCE AND INTENTIONS TO LEAVE QUEBEC

Introduction

It has been shown in Chapter Three that Montreal Anglophones maintain considerable social distance between themselves and Francophones in various dimensions of contact. In Chapter Four, it was found that, apart from age, variables that are associated traditionally with migrant selectivity did not explain much of the variance in the propensity to migrate. The present chapter will suggest that stress associated with francization may encourage search behaviour for Quebec Anglophones. We measure stress in terms of the respondents' perceptions of prejudice against Anglophones in Quebec and by the extent to which the respondents are 'socially distant' from Francophones.

5.1 Stress in the Anglophone Community

Theories of contact between groups generally explain that conflict is not present when two groups can live independently with parallel sets of institutions that meet their needs. Here the 'ethnic strategy' may be one of either 'avoidance' or 'accommoda-

tion' (see Allport, 1954). Some writers maintain that increased contact between groups can lead to intensified conflict. Contrary to this position, many other observers have determined that increased contact tends to lessen or even dispel conflict. It would seem then that the best that can be said of this contradiction of findings is that inter-group contact may generate either conflict or harmony and that the direction taken probably varies with historical as well as specific contemporary circumstances.

Certainly an historical survey of Anglophones in Quebec would reveal that avoidance behaviour has typified this population. Moreover, the English in Quebec have enjoyed the privilege of being a minority with majority status. Thus, one of the interesting questions for Quebec in the 1980's is whether the encapsulation of the Anglophone community can be maintained given that the 'majority status' of this minority is diminishing rapidly. It can be argued that if the members of a group perceive themselves as being threatened by another group, then the avoidance/encapsulation strategy is no longer sufficient.

Our data show that many Anglophones are unhappy with their change in status. Table 5.1 shows that over eighty percent of respondents in the sample are opposed to Bill 101. Table 5.2 (1) reveals that

16.7 percent of the Antlophones in our sample believe that there exists 'very strong prejudice' against Anglophones in Quebec. Approximately forty percent feel that 'some prejudice' exists, while 37.3 percent state that there is a 'little prejudice'. Only 5.6 percent of the sample report that there is 'no prejudice' against Quebec Anglophones. Similarly, in Table 5.3 we find that 72.4 percent of the sample think that there is job discrimination against Anglophones in Quebec.

Variations in attitude are revealed when we differentiate respondents by ethnic background. In Table 5.4, 32.6 percent of Jewish respondents perceive very strong prejudice against Anglophones. In contrast to this, only fifteen percent of Angloceltics and 9.8 percent of the 'Other' ethnics believe that 'very strong prejudice' is present in Quebec. With respect to job discrimination, eighty-one percent of Jewish respondents, 72.4 percent of Angloceltics, and sixty-four percent of the 'Other' ethnics state that job discrimination does exist.

5.2 Migration as Strategy

The migration literature reports that perceptions of political, economic and social conditions are likely to influence the individual in his decision to migrate. More importantly, it is not necessary for the objective situations to exist as long as they

are perceived to be real.

Clearly, discontent is apparent in the Anglophone community. Yet while much speculation and many inferences have been made about the so-called Anglophone 'exodus', there has been little evidence that the decision to leave Quebec is prompted by such discontent. We hypothesized that intentions to migrate should be associated with attitudes about the group's position in Quebec and, with well as to the extent to which the Anglophone was already integrated into Quebec's Francophone milieu.

3.3 Migration Intentions and Perception of Prejudice

To test for a possible relationship between ethnic-type stress and migration, perception of prejudice against Anglophones in Quebec was correlated with intentions to migrate. Table 5.6 (2) shows that there is a low positive association of .16 between the two variables. In other words, the greater the perception of prejudice against Anglophones in Quebec, the higher the propensity to migrate.

Comparing correlations within age groups, it is found that the relationship is slightly stronger for respondents aged 18 to 34. This seems reasonable; as early as 1969, Johnstone reported that young Quebec Anglophones were comparatively pessimistic about

finding job opportunities in Quebec since they would not face ethnic minority status in the rest of Canada.

Ethnic differences again reveal that Jewish respondents in general respond differently to pressures than do other Anglophones. For the Jewish group there is a moderate association of .32 between perception of prejudice and intentions to leave Quebec. For Angloceltics and for 'Other' ethnics the association is below .2. Thus, not only do Jewish respondents perceive greater amounts of prejudice against Anglophones, this perception is more likely to influence the decision to migrate.

Educational differences, while significant for two groups, do not allow for reliable interpretation.

5.4 Migration and Knowledge of French

We have stressed that language is a good indicator of the extent to which an individual is comfortable with another group. It is reasonable to suppose that, in the context of Quebec, intentions to leave the province may be linked closely to fluency in French. This is an especially pertinent observation when added to the recognition that knowledge of French is linked strongly to occupational opportunities in the province of Quebec. Caldwell's

study confirmed that French language fluency was related to out-migration - indeed, this relationship confounded what appeared to be a direct association between mother tongue and outmigration.

The data appearing in Table 5.7 provides support for the language hypothesis although the association is not striking. Thirty-four percent of those who speak French fluently have definite or probable intentions of leaving Quebec, compared to fifty percent of those who do not speak French at all.

Having entertained the belief that the language proposition would be particularly relevant for young Anglophones, we were surprised to acknowledge that no linear relationship was present. This may be a result of our small sample size. For respondents aged 18 to 34, the gamma value was $-.22$, for respondents aged 35 to 49, the value was $-.10$ as compared to the value of $-.40$ for the 50 to 65 age bracket. Comparing this relationship with respect to ethnic group and educational background fails to expose any significant differences.

In sum, it can be said that there does appear to be a direct association between knowledge of French and migration intentions, but that this association is quite low.

5.5 Migration and Contact with Anglophones

In Chapter Three we examined different dimensions of Anglophone contact with Francophones and concluded that Anglophones, in 1978 still showed strong preferences for Anglophone associations for both formal and informal types of contact. This, coupled with a strong perception of prejudice and distrust of Bill 101 leads to the supposition that, within the Anglophone community, individuals who are well integrated into French Quebec will be less likely to entertain thoughts about leaving the province. Similarly, those who are isolated will be more likely to think about leaving. Admittedly, this hypothesis favours the theory that increased contact lessens hostility between groups.

Tables 5.8 through 5.10 summarize the relationship between contact dimension variables and intentions to leave Quebec. Table 5.8 displays intentions to migrate by spouse's mother tongue. Tables 5.9 and 5.10 show correlations between number of Francophone friends and intentions to emigrate, and number of Francophone co-workers and intentions to emigrate, respectively.

In general, it would appear that 'contact' in various dimensions of social distance does not explain much variance in the propensity to leave Quebec.

Family

In Table 5.8, respondents married to English spouses are revealed to be more inclined to state intentions to leave Quebec than are those respondents married to Francophones or 'Others'. Almost forty percent of respondents in English marriages said that they would definitely or probably leave Quebec in the next five years, compared to only 11.8 percent of those married to Francophones and 25.9 percent of those married to 'Other' ethnic types. Thus, although the numbers are small, marriage to a Francophone would seem to inhibit thoughts about leaving Quebec. Of course, it is not clear whether this represents a relationship between contact and migration since the decision to migrate is usually made with one's spouse, i.e., through a process of joint deliberation.

Friends

Table 5.9 shows that there is only a low association between number of Francophone friends and propensity to migrate. When we look at different age groups we find that while this association is negligible for those over the age of thirty-four, the association for younger respondents is .22.

Ethnic comparisons reveal no association for Jewish respondents but a moderate association of .36 for 'Other' ethnic types. For educational groups, the association is strongest in the lowest

educational category, but it should be noted that differences between groups are minimal.

Co-workers

In Table 5.10, similar patterns appear. Overall, a low association exists between contact with Francophones at work and intentions to migrate. When we control for age, we find only a low association for respondents in the 18-34 age category. Controlling for ethnic background and education, the numbers in some categories are so small as to render the results unreliable.

5.6 Social Distance Attitudes and Intentions to Leave Quebec

Table 5.11 shows a low association between Bogardus social distance scores and intentions to leave Quebec. Differences are seen most clearly when we look at extreme scores. Among those respondents who are most favourably inclined towards contact with Francophones, 13.3 percent state that they are 'definitely leaving' Quebec while 27.2 percent report that they are 'definitely not leaving'. In comparison with these results, in the case of respondents least favourably inclined towards contact with Francophones, 27.3 percent state that they will 'definitely leave' the province, as compared to only 9.1 percent who report they will 'definitely not' leave Quebec.

Conclusions

No definite assertions can be deduced from such weak relationships. Certainly there is some evidence that social distance variables may explain some of the variance in the propensity to leave Quebec. Knowledge of French, the perception of prejudice, and social distance attitudes are all more strongly associated with migration plans than are contacts with Francophones. Ignoring some of the inconsistencies, the data suggest that social distance is a greater inhibiting factor in the migration intentions of younger as compared to older Anglophones.

NOTES

1. Interviewers asked respondents whether or not they believed that there was prejudice against Anglophones in Quebec in closed-ended questions. While the objectivity of responses can be criticized by this type of question, interviewers reported that in general throughout the interview, respondents remarked on the plight of the Anglophone without any prompting to do so.
2. For tables 5.6, 5.9, 5.10, Pearson's r is used to interpret the strength of the relationship between variables. This represents a somewhat unorthodox use of the correlation coefficient since many of the variables are ordinal. While gamma was the more appropriate statistic, its reliability is reduced where there are low or zero cell counts in cross-tabulation. Pearson's r was used to point out possible associations between variables.

TABLE 5.1
REACTION TO BILL 101

	<u>8</u>	<u>N</u>
In favour	7.8	25
Mixed reaction	9.6	31
Against	82.6	266
TOTAL	100.0	322

TABLE 5.2
RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTION OF PREJUDICE
AGAINST ANGLOPHONES IN QUEBEC

	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
Very strong prejudice	16.7	54
Some prejudice	40.4	131
A little prejudice	37.3	121
No prejudice	5.6	18
TOTAL	100.0	324

TABLE 5.3
PERCEPTION OF JOB DISCRIMINATION
FOR ANGLOPHONES IN QUEBEC

	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
Yes	72.4	212
No	27.6	81
TOTAL	100.0	293

TABLE 5.4
PERCEPTION OF PREJUDICE AGAINST ANGLOPHONES.
BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Perceived prejudice	<u>Angloceltic</u>	<u>Jewish</u>	<u>Other</u>
Very strong prejudice	15.0	32.6	9.8
Some prejudice	36.4	43.5	52.9
A little prejudice	42.7	19.6	33.3
No prejudice	5.9	4.3	3.9
TOTAL %	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(220)	(46)	(51)

χ^2 , sig. .01

TABLE 5.5

PERCEPTION OF JOB DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ANGLOPHONES
BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Is there job discrimination?	<u>Angloceltic</u>	<u>Jewish</u>	<u>Other</u>
Yes	72.4	81.0	64.0
No	27.6	19.0	36.0
TOTAL %	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(196)	(42)	(50)

χ^2 , ns.

TABLE 5.6

ZERO ORDER CORRELATIONS OF INTENTIONS TO MIGRATE WITH PERCEPTION
OF PREJUDICE AGAINST ANGLOPHONES BY AGE, EDUCATION AND ETHNIC
BACKGROUND

Perception of prejudice with intention to migrate	r	N	Sig.
All	.1602	(285)	**
<u>Age</u>			
18-33	.1820	(125)	*
34-49	.1777	(98)	*
50-65	.0646	(62)	ns.
<u>Education</u>			
Less than high school	.3667	(51)	**
high school	-.0128	(108)	ns.
high school plus	.2327	(126)	**
<u>Ethnic</u>			
Angloceltic	.1348	(199)	*
Jewish	.3170	(41)	*
Other	.1274	(40)	ns.

* sig. = .05

** sig. = .005

TABLE 5.7

INTENTIONS TO MIGRATE BY RESPONDENT'S PROFICIENCY IN FRENCH

Intentions to leave	Speaks French fluently	Nearly fluently	Some difficulty	Lot of difficulty	Not at all
Definitely leaving	8.2	11.9	15.1	14.1	20.6
Probably leaving	26.2	23.7	26.0	29.7	29.4
Probably not leaving	37.7	30.5	42.5	39.1	29.4
Definitely not leaving	27.9	33.9	16.4	17.2	20.6
TOTAL %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(61)	(59)	(73)	(64)	(34)

 χ^2 ns., gamma = .144

TABLE 5.8
INTENTIONS TO MIGRATE BY SPOUSE'S MOTHER TONGUE

Intentions to leave Quebec	Spouse's mother tongue		
	English	French	Other
Definitely leaving	10.4	5.9	7.4
Probably leaving	28.8	5.9	18.5
Probably not leaving	40.8	58.8	33.3
Definitely not leaving	20.0	29.4	40.7
TOTAL %	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(125)	(17)	(27)

χ^2 , ns.

TABLE 5.9

PEARSON'S r CORRELATIONS: INTENTIONS TO MIGRATE WITH CONTACT
WITH FRANCOPHONE FRIENDS. CONTROLLING FOR AGE, EDUCATION,
AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Contact with intentions to migrate	r	N	Sig.
<u>All</u>	.1516	(281)	**
18-33	.2191	(121)	**
34-49	--	(99)	--
50-65	--	(61)	--
<u>Education</u>			
less than high school	.2339	(50)	*
high school	.1150	(109)	--
high school plus	.1216	(122)	*
<u>Ethnic</u>			
Angloceltic	.1049	(196)	*
Jewish	--	(41)	--
Other	.3658	(39)	*

* sig. = .05

** sig. = .005

TABLE 5.10

PEARSON'S r CORRELATIONS: INTENTIONS TO MIGRATE WITH CONTACT
WITH FRANCOPHONE CO-WORKERS, CONTROLLING FOR AGE, EDUCATION,
AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND,

Contact with intention to migrate	r	N	sig.
All	.1106	(156)	*
<u>Age</u>			
18-33	.1677	(66)	*
34-49	--	(66)	--
50-65	--	(24)	--
<u>Education</u>			
less than high school	--	(20)	*
high school	.1571	(70)	*
high school plus	.1008	(66)	--
<u>Ethnic</u>			
Angloceltic	--	(108)	--
Jewish	.1314	(23)	--
Other	--	(23)	--

* sig. = .05

**sig. = .005

TABLE 5.11

INTENTIONS TO MIGRATE BY RESPONDENTS' SCORE ON BOGARDUS SCALE

Intentions to migrate	Bogardus score (1)				
	Low social distance - high social distance				
	1	2	3	4	5
Definitely leaving	13.3	10.3	10.5	13.5	27.3
Probably leaving	23.9	13.8	31.6	40.4	36.4
Probably not leaving	35.6	62.1	26.3	32.7	27.3
Definitely not leaving	27.2	13.8	31.6	13.5	9.1
TOTAL %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(180)	(29)	(19)	(52)	(11)

chi-square = 20.65381, df = 12
alpha = .05, gamma = -.18

1. Bogardus score has been recoded into five categories (See Appendix III).

CHAPTER SIX

IDENTIFYING MIGRANT TYPES

Introduction

One of the basic premises of this study was that we would be able to identify potential migrants as those who felt especially uncomfortable in a rapidly francizing Quebec. What we have seen is that while a majority of Anglophones remain isolated by language, contact, and attitude, these variables do not account for significant variance in the propensity to leave Quebec. Of course, migration is behaviour that cannot help but be the complex outcome of many different determinants. Only a few of these can be observed and measured properly with small-scale survey analysis. In this final chapter we advance a typology that divides our sample into two groups of potential migrants in an attempt to make some generalizations about our findings.

6.1 The Peterson Typology

Peterson and others have identified two basic types of migrants. Using Peterson's terminology, the "innovative emigrant" responds predominantly to pull factors at his intended destination, is generally positively selected,

and views his move as a means of long term personal achievement. Conversely, the "conservative emigrant" more closely characterizes the sedentary population, is negatively selected in terms of status, and regards his situation as one where remaining involves a risk of losing a position already attained.

One of the underlying themes of our discussion of Anglophones leaving Quebec has been that the emigration of Anglophones could be understood as a conservative type of migration. Indeed, most of the available literature on the subject has followed the 'conservative' line of thinking.

6.2 Operationalizing the Peterson Typology

In order to differentiate between innovative and conservative migration intentions, we required a measure of migrant motivation that would clearly dichotomize our potential migrants (1). With the available data we concluded that it was possible to divide our respondents according to their intentions to leave Quebec under given hypothetical conditions. As such we identified "innovative" respondents as those who:

- a) had intentions ("definite" or "probable") to leave Quebec within a five year future; and
- b) had intentions ("definite" or "probable") to leave Quebec within a five year future given the scenario

that the Parti Quebecois lost a referendum for the independence of Quebec.

Respondents were identified as "conservative" if they:

- a) had intentions ("definite" or "probable") to leave Quebec within a five year future; and
- b) had no intentions ("probably not" or "definitely not") to leave Quebec within a five year future given the scenario that the Parti Quebecois has lost a referendum for independence.

Table 6.1 shows the distribution of migrant types for our sample. Innovative types account for 25.6 percent of the total sample, or approximately seventy percent of the potential migrant sub-sample. Conservative types account for 15.2 percent of the total sample, or thirty percent of the potential migrant sub-sample. Thus, a much higher percentage of our respondents having intentions to migrate may be classified as "innovative".

Bearing in mind that this dichotomy reduces the size of comparable categories of potential migrants, we can nevertheless hypothesize that the characteristics of respondents labelled "conservative" and those considered "innovative" will be quite different. We hypothesized that:

1. The innovative respondent would be comparably more positively selected than the conservative migrant;
and
2. The conservative migrant would be comparably less comfortable in Quebec for language and social distance-type reasons, and negatively selected with respect to major socio-economic characteristics.

6.3 Distinguishing Characteristics of Innovative and Conservative Respondents

When we compare types by attributes that are associated traditionally with migration: sex, age, education, and occupation, we do encounter significant differences between innovative and conservative types.

Sex

Table 6.2 shows male and female respondents by migrant type. Approximately seventy percent of male emigrants are "innovative" compared to fifty-five percent of female emigrants.

Age

Table 6.3 distinguishes migrant type by average age of respondent. As hypothesized, innovative migrants are more positively selected with a mean age of thirty-one compared to conservative types where the mean age is 35.1. The sedentary group is predictably the oldest with an average age of 40.1 years.

Education

Similarly, Table 6.4 shows that innovative types are more positively selected with respect to educational achievement. Looking at average years of education we find that, compared to innovative types as well as the sedentary groups with respective scores of 13.8 and 13.3 years, the conservative migrant has an average of 11.8 years of education.

Occupation

Finally, looking at migrant type comparisons by occupational status we find that in Table 6.5, among professional category respondents, 73.3 percent are innovative types. This contrasts with 46.4 percent in clerical, white collar jobs, and 55.6 percent of those in blue collar occupations.

In sum, although our sample size is small, we have reasonable impressionistic evidence to show that differentiating respondents by migrant type does reveal selective differences. Innovative types are typically more likely to be male, younger, better educated and in higher occupational positions than are conservative types. In addition, Table 6.6 shows innovative and conservative types by ethnic background. Here the differences probably reflect differential achievement levels with respect to education and occupation. Thus, Jewish respondents were most likely to be innovative types.

Turning to our hypothesis that the conservative migrant is responding to stress associated with his position as an Anglophone

in Quebec, in Table 6.7 we compare migrant types on various measures of comfortable integration into Quebec society. For all measures with the exception of one, our hypothesis is confirmed although mean differences are not substantial.

Knowledge of French

Looking at fluency in French, conservative migrants score lowest at .43, while innovative migrants score only .45. Non-migrants score highest at .51.

Perception of Prejudice

Predictably, conservative emigrants have a greater perception of prejudice against Anglophones in Quebec than do innovative or sedentary respondents. Again, the actual differences between means are small. Conservative types score an average of .34 while innovative types score .28 and non-emigrants score .25.

Contact with Francophone Friends

Looking at actual contact with Francophones we discover that conservative types have an average of .30 Francophone friends compared with innovative types with an average of .41 Francophone friends. Non-migrants score highest with an average of .55 Francophone friends. Of course, what is striking here is the

low level of contact for all three groups of respondents.

Contact with Francophone Co-workers

In this dimension of contact, conservative types score highest with an average of 2.1 Francophone contacts in the workplace.

Innovative types have an average of 1.1 Francophone contacts while non-migrants score 1.5. Given that the number of respondents is so small, we can only speculate that contact which is not chosen by the respondent may be threatening given an environment which is competitive on many levels. Thus the number of Francophone co-workers may represent increased francization in the workplace.

Conclusions

Our typology does reveal actual differences between migrant types in the areas of migrant selectivity and integration into Quebec society. A larger percentage of Anglophones with migration intentions conform to the attributes of the typical migrant, while less than a quarter of Anglophones with migration intentions can be labelled conservative types.

This brief experiment with the Peterson typology permits us to suggest that there may be two distinct migrations in Quebec: the

first corresponding to normal population movement; and the second, triggered by the new status of the Anglophone in Quebec. While these two movements are certainly interdependent, we contend that considering migrant types separately in this manner helps to uncover differences that are often missed in migration studies.

In sum, we argue that the question of 'Why are they migrating?' be considered prior to the question of 'who are the migrants?'.

This is primarily an argument for more research probing the motivations of migrants.

NOTES

1. Potential migrants include respondents who stated an intention 'definite' or 'probable' to leave Quebec in the next five years. We sometimes refer to these respondents as 'migrants' to facilitate the interpretation. In reality, they are potential migrants only.

TABLE 6.1
DISTRIBUTION OF EMIGRANT TYPE

	N	% of total	% of total emigrants
innovative	71	25.6	62.3
conservative	43	15.2	37.7
non-migrant	281	60.2	
TOTAL			100.0

TABLE 6.2

EMIGRANT TYPE BY SEX

emigrant type	male	female	total
innovative	70.3	55.0	62.3
conservative	29.7	45.0	37.7
TOTAL %	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(54)	(60)	(114)

TABLE 6.3
EMIGRANT TYPES, AVERAGE AGE

emigrant type	x	sd	N	
innovative	31.1	10.4	(71)	F-test sig. at .05
conservative	35.8	12.7	(43)	
non-migrant	40.4	13.3	(167)	

TABLE 6.4
EMIGRANT TYPE: MEAN EDUCATION IN YEARS

emigrant type	$\bar{X}$	sd	N	
innovative	13.8	3.5	71	
conservative	11.8	2.7	43	F-test sig. at .01
non-migrant	13.3	3.8	167	

TABLE 6.5
EMIGRANT TYPE BY OCCUPATION

emigrant type	Professional	Clerical	Manual
innovative	73.3	46.4	55.5
conservative	26.7	53.6	44.5
TOTAL %	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(30)	(28)	(9)

χ^2 ns.

TABLE 6.6
EMIGRANT TYPE BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

emigrant type	Ethnic Background			
	Angloceltic	Jewish	Other	
innovative	62.5	76.5	54.2	62.5
conservative	37.5	23.5	45.8	37.7
TOTAL %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(72)	(17)	(24)	(113)

χ^2 ns.

TABLE 6.7
CONTACT VARIABLES BY EMIGRANT TYPE, MEAN SCORES

		emigrant type		
		Innovative	Conservative	Non-migrant
a. Eluency in French (1)	$\bar{X}$	.45	.43	.51
	sd	.33	.32	.32
	N	(71)	(43)	(167)
b. Perception of prejudice against Anglophones	$\bar{X}$	.28	.34	.25
	sd	.20	.18	.20
	N	(70)	(43)	(162)
c. Number of Francophone friends	$\bar{X}$	.41	.30	.55
	sd	.63	.46	.77
	N	(68)	(40)	(164)
d. Number of Francophone co-workers	$\bar{X}$	1.1	2.1	1.5
	sd	1.3	1.8	1.3
	N	(35)	(27)	(89)

1. Ordinal-type questions were standardized so that mean scores could be obtained. Frequencies by percentage totals in categories are shown in Chapter Three.

CONCLUSION

In the early chapters of this paper, we have described the dilemma facing the Anglophone population of Quebec. We have pointed out that even without the exodus of English-speaking Quebecers, low birthrates, declining English immigration, and declining immigrant assimilation into the English sector have resulted in a demographic crisis which has had and continues to present severe implications for the English population of Quebec. Moreover, while we have shown that Anglophones in Montreal are advantaged in socio-economic terms, they are not yet comfortable in a "Quebe-
cois" society: they do not, for the most part, speak French adequately; contacts with Francophones are minimal; and attitudes towards language policies are hostile.

In a recent publication (A. Stein, 1982), the English community reaction is described as having moved from self-confident majority status to that of a self-conscious minority:

...in the early stages, it was expressed in excessive emotionalism, particularly evident in the anti-Bill 22 protests - in later stages it was replaced by feelings of impotence and despair. It was apparent that the Anglophone community needed to alleviate this psychological dissonance by redefining its self image and forging a new role for itself in Quebec, unless it decided to opt out of the province entirely.

The central premise of this study was that the decision to leave Quebec has been related closely to this type of stress. That forty percent of Anglophones in our sample stated that they would definitely or probably leave Quebec in five years is convincing evidence that thoughts about migration are widespread.

When we investigated the questions of who was migrating and what motivations for migrating existed, it was found that, apart from age and, to a lesser extent, knowledge of French, no single factor or collection of factors could adequately explain the intention to leave Quebec. Our discussion of emigrant types did, however, help to identify more clearly the attributes of our potential migrant. Comparing innovative and conservative types led us to the finding that the innovative respondent was more positively selected with respect to age, education, and the type of occupation. Conversely, the conservative respondent was somewhat less likely to be comfortable in Quebec when we compared for knowledge of French, attitudes about prejudice against Anglophones, and contact with Francophones.

In the end, we must call attention to the fact that although our measure of migration "intention to leave Quebec" depicts future action at best, it must also be seen as an attitude independent of the actual decision to leave Quebec. This is most evident when

we consider those Anglophones whom we have called 'conservative' types: these individuals change their intention to leave Quebec depending on whether the government loses a referendum of independence for Quebec, and this strongly suggests that the stated intention to leave Quebec may be an expression of protest as much as a statement of future migration.

Given the absence of organized English opposition to changes in Quebec, as well as the example set by large English corporations who have moved their head offices out of Quebec, voicing one's intention to leave Quebec may simply be a response to feelings of impotence and disapproval of the situation. Moreover, if an Anglophone is entertaining thoughts about leaving Quebec, he does not take steps to integrate himself into Quebec society.

These are several interesting hypotheses which deserve better attention. In 1983, a follow-up survey of respondents was conducted in order to determine whether migration intentions had been followed through. The findings of this research will be available shortly.

APPENDIX I - THE BOGARDUS SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

<u>A.1 Items</u>	<u>very</u> <u>willing</u>	<u>willing</u>	<u>not very</u> <u>willing</u>	<u>not at all</u> <u>willing</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Number of</u> <u>Respondents</u>
Willingness to have...						
1. French Canadian as family member by marriage	65.6	26.0	4.2	4.2	100.0	331
2. French Canadian as a close personal friend	79.2	19.6	.9	.3	100.0	332
3. French Canadian to your home for supper	83.1	16.0	.6	.3	100.0	332
4. French Canadian to visit with	82.2	16.6	1.2	---	100.0	332
5. French Canadian as a member of your social club	81.2	18.2	.3	.3	100.0	330
6. French Canadian as your next-door neighbour	82.2	16.6	.9	.3	100.0	332
7. French Canadian as a co-worker	81.6	16.9	1.2	.3	100.0	331

A.2 Scale Construction

Scale scores were obtained by adding values for each item. A value of 0 was given for "very willing", 1 for "willing", 2 for "not very willing", and 3 for "not at all willing". Scores were standardized at 0 (very willing) to 1 (not at all willing).

A.3 Frequency Distribution

Value	Percentage	Recoding for Table 3.6	Low Social Distance
0.0	62.3	LOW	
0.048	10.3		
0.095	6.5		
0.143	2.3		
0.190	1.5	MODERATE	
0.237	0.9		
0.274	2.1		
0.321	10.7		
0.368	2.4	HIGH	
0.476	0.6		
0.666	0.3		
	1		
1.00	---		High Social Distance

APPENDIX II- THE QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

McGILL UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Project

MIGRATION AND MULTICULTURALISM IN CANADA

GROUP: ANGLOPHONES

Date: _____

Time: _____

Place: _____

Language
used: _____

Interviewer: _____

Respondent:

--	--	--

1 2 3

I.D. Number

0 1

Card Number

4 5

6

[1] Sex

Male.....1

Female.....2

[2] Where were you born?

7 8 9

Montreal.....1 → [GO TO Q. 3]

Other Place in Canada.....2

[SPECIFY] City: _____

Province: _____ → [GO TO Q. 12]

Outside Canada.....3

[SPECIFY] City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____ → [GO TO Q. 22]

FOR RESPONDENTS BORN IN MONTREAL

[3] Have you ever stayed elsewhere for more than six months continuously?

12

Yes, outside of Canada.....1

Yes, within Canada.....2

Yes, both outside & within Canada....3

No.....4 → [GO TO Q. 40]

DK/NA.....9 → [GO TO Q. 40]

[4] Where did you spend most of your life before age 18?

13 14 15

16 17

City _____

Province _____

Country _____

[IF MONTREAL GO TO Q. 7]

[5] What was the approximate population of that [city, town...] when you finally left there?

18

Less than 5,000.....1 100,000 - 499,999.....5

5,000 - 9,999.....2 500,000 - 1,000,000.....6

10,000 - 29,999.....3 Over 1,000,000.....7

30,000 - 99,999.....4 DK/NA.....9

19

[6] Was this your last permanent residence before you came back to Montreal?

Yes.....1 → [GO TO Q.10]

No.....2

DK/NA.....9 → [GO TO Q.11]

[7] Where was your last permanent residence before you came back to Montreal?

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[8] For how long did you live there?

_____ years

[9] What was the approximate population of that [city, town,] when you finally left there?

Less than 5,000.....1	100,000 - 499,999.....5
5,000 - 9,999.....2	500,000 - 1,000,000...6
10,000 - 29,999.....3	Over 1,000,000.....7
30,000 - 99,999.....4	DK/NA.....9

[10] Why did you leave?

[11] Why did you come back to Montreal?

→ [GO TO Q.38]

FOR RESPONDENTS BORN IN OTHER CANADIAN CITIES

[12] What was the approximate population of that [city, town,] when you finally left there?

Less than 5,000.....1	100,000 - 499,999.....5
5,000 - 9,999.....2	500,000 - 1,000,000...6
10,000 - 29,999.....3	Over 1,000,000.....7
30,000 - 99,999.....4	DK/NA.....9

40

[13] Where did you spend most of your life before age 18?

41

Place of birth.....1 → [GO TO Q.16]

Montreal.....2 → [GO TO Q.15]

Other Place.....3

[SPECIFY] City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

42 43 44

45 46

[14] What was the approximate population of that [city, town..] when you finally left there?

47

Less than 5,000.....1	100,000 - 499,999.....5
5,000 - 9,999.....2	500,000 - 1,000,000.....6
10,000 - 29,999.....3	Over 1,000,000.....7
30,000 - 99,999.....4	DK/NA.....9

→ [GO TO Q.16]

[15] Have you ever lived elsewhere for more than 6 months continuously?

48

Yes.....1 → [GO TO Q.17]

No.....2 → [GO TO Q.40]

DK/NA.....9 → [GO TO Q.40]

[16] Was this your last permanent residence before coming to Montreal?

49

Yes.....1 → [GO TO Q.20]

No.....2

DK/NA.....9

[17] Where was your last permanent residence before coming to Montreal?

50 51 52

53 54

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[IF NO ANSWER: GO TO Q.40]

[18] How long did you live there?

55 56

_____ years

[19] What was the approximate population of that
[city, town..] when you finally left there?

57

Less than 5,000.....1	100,000 - 499,999.....5
5,000 - 9,999.....2	500,000 - 1,000,000...6
10,000 - 29,999.....3	Over 1,000,000.....7
30,000 - 99,999.....4	DK/NA.....9

[20] Why did you leave there?

58 59 60

61 62 63

[21] Why did you come to Montreal?

64 65 66

67 68 69

→ [GO TO Q. 38]

FOR RESPONDENTS BORN OUTSIDE OF CANADA

[22] What was the approximate population of that
[city, town..] when you finally left there?

70

Less than 5,0001	100,000 - 499,999.....5
5,000 - 9,999.....2	500,000 - 1,000,000...6
10,000 - 29,999.....3	Over 1,000,000.....7
30,000 - 99,999.....4	DK/NA.....9

[23] Why did you leave your place of birth?

71 72 73

74 75 76

1 2 3
0 2
4 5

I.D. Number

Card Number

5

[24] Where did you spend most of your life before age 18?

6
7 8 9 10

Place of birth.....1 → [GO TO Q.30]

Other place.....2

[SPECIFY] City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

Montreal.....3 → [GO TO Q.26]

[25] What was the approximate population of that [city, town..] when you finally left there?

11

Less than 5,000.....1

100,000 - 499,999.....5

5,000 - 9,999.....2

500,000 - 1,000,000...6

10,000 - 29,999.....3

Over 1,000,000.....7

30,000 - 99,999.....4

DK/NA.....9

→ [GO TO Q.30]

[26] Not including your birthplace, have you ever lived outside of Montreal for more than 6 months continuously?

12

Yes.....1

No.....2 → [GO TO Q.40]

DK/NA.....9

[27] Where was your last permanent residence before coming back to Montreal?

13 14 15
16 17

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____ [IF NO ANSWER: GO TO Q.40]

[28] How long did you live there?

18 19

_____ years

[29] What was the approximate population of that [city, town..] when you finally left there?

20

Less than 5,0001

100,000 - 499,999.....5

5,000 - 9,999.....2

500,000 - 1,000,000...6

10,000 - 29,999.....3

Over 1,000,000.....7

30,000 - 99,999.....4

DK/NA.....9

→ [GO TO Q.38]

[30] Where were you living just before coming to Montreal?

OUTSIDE CANADA

Birthplace.....1 → [GO TO Q.33]

Place where you
spent life before

age 18.....2 → [GO TO Q.32]

Other.....3

[SPECIFY] City: _____

INSIDE CANADA

Place where you spent
life before age

18.....4 → [GO TO Q.35]

Other.....5

[SPECIFY] _____

[31] What was the approximate population of that
[city, town..] when you finally left there?

Less than 5,000.....1

5,000 - 9,999.....2

10,000 - 29,999.....3

30,000 - 99,999.....4

100,000 - 499,999.....5

500,000 - 1,000,000.....6

Over 1,000,000.....7

DK/NA.....9

[32] Why did you leave there?

[33] Why did you come to Canada?

[34] What country do you consider as your home country?

[35] Why did you come to Montreal and not another city?

[36] How many years have you been living in Canada; in total?

_____ years

[37] How many years since you last moved to Canada?

_____ years

[38] How long have you been living in Montreal; in total?

_____ years

[39] How long since you last moved here?

55 56

_____ years

[40] Of what country are you a citizen?

57

58 59 60

Canada.....1 → [GO TO Q.47]
Great Britain.....2
France.....3
U.S.A.....4
Other [SPECIFY].....5 _____

[41] Do you plan to become a Canadian citizen?

61

Definitely yes.....1
Probably yes.....2
Uncertain.....3
Probably not.....4
Definitely not.....5
DK/NA.....9

[42] Are you eligible to become a Canadian citizen?

62

Yes.....1
No.....2 → [GO TO Q.46]
DK/NA.....9 → [GO TO Q.46]

[43] Why have you not taken citizenship so far?

63 64

[44] In your opinion, what will be the advantages of becoming a Canadian citizen?

65 66 67

68 69 70

[45] What will be the disadvantages of becoming a Canadian citizen?

71 72 73

74 75 76

1 2 3

I.D. Number

0 3
4 5

Card Number

[46] There are some people who regret having come to Canada, there are some who are pleased they came to Canada. How do you feel? Are you:

Very happy.....1
Happy.....2
Inbetween.....3
Unhappy.....4
Very unhappy.....5
DK/NA.....9

[47] Everything taken into consideration, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with life in Canada?

Very satisfied.....1
Satisfied.....2
Inbetween.....3
Dissatisfied.....4
Very dissatisfied.....5
DK/NA.....9

[48] Do you feel that Canada is a good country to live in, compared to most other countries?

Yes, much better.....1
Yes, a little better.....2
About the same as others.....3
No, a little worse.....4
No, a lot worse.....5

[49] If you were completely free to choose, would you live in Canada?

Yes, definitely.....1
Yes, probably.....2
No, probably not.....3
No, definitely not.....4

[INTERVIEWER SAY TO RESPONDENT]NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR
EDUCATION AND OCCUPATION.

- [50] How many years of schooling have you completed?
[Excluding kindergarten]

10 11

_____ years

- [51] Have you done all these years of study in one place
[city, town..]?

Yes.....1

[SPECIFY] _____ → [GO TO Q.53]

No.....2

- [52] Could you please tell me, chronologically, the names
of the cities or towns, where you have gone to school?

Place Level of educ. [i.e. high school]

18 19 20

21 22 23

24 25 26

- [53] What is the highest diploma or degree you received?

27 28

None.....00
Elementary/Primary.....01
Secondary/High School.....02
Post High School/C.E.G.E.P.....03
College.....04
Bachelor.....05

[SPECIFY] _____
Masters.....06

[SPECIFY] _____
Doctor.....07

[SPECIFY] _____
Professional degree.....08

[SPECIFY] _____
Technical degree.....09

[SPECIFY] _____
Other.....10

[SPECIFY] _____
DK/NA.....99

- [54] In what city or town did you receive your highest diploma or degree?

29 30 31

City: _____

Province: _____

32 33

Country: _____

- [55] With whom did you live when you were young, say when you were around 16 years old?

34 35

Both parents.....1
Father only.....2
Mother only.....3
Other.....4

[SPECIFY] _____

DK/NA.....9 → [GO TO Q.64]

- [56] How many years of schooling has your father [OR MALE HOUSEHOLD HEAD OR FEMALE HOUSEHOLD HEAD OR MOTHER] completed? [Excluding kindergarten]

36 37

_____ years

- [57] What is the highest diploma or degree he/she received?

38 39

None.....00
Elementary/Primary.....01
Secondary/High School.....02
Post High School/C.E.G.E.P.....03
College.....04
Bachelor.....05
Master.....06
Doctor.....07
Professional degree.....08

[SPECIFY] _____

Other.....09

[SPECIFY] _____

DK/NA.....99

- [58] What was your father's [OR SUBSTITUTE IF FATHER WAS ABSENT] full-time occupation when you were young, say, when you were around 16 years old?

40

[59] In what kind of business, industry or service was he/she working?

41 42

[60] What was his/her position or title?

43 44 45 46

[61] What is his/her present full-time occupation, or what was the one he/she held at the time of his/her retirement or at the time of his/her death?

47

→ [IF NO ANSWER: GO TO Q.64]

[62] In what kind of business, industry or service is/was he/she working?

48 49

[63] What is/was his/her position or title?

50 51 52 53

[64] Have you ever worked full-time?

54

No.....1 → [GO TO Q.99]

Yes.....2

DK/NA.....9 → [GO TO Q.99]

[65] What was your first full-time occupation?

55

[66] In what kind of business, industry or service were you working?

56 57

[67] What position did you hold last in this job?

58 59 60 61

[68] In which city, province or country did you hold that job?

62 63 64

City: _____

65 66

Province: _____ → [IF MONTREAL:
GO TO Q.81]

Country: _____ → [IF OTHER CANADIAN
CITY: GO TO Q.77]

IF RESPONDENT'S FIRST OCCUPATION WAS OUTSIDE CANADA

[69] What was your last full-time occupation before you came to Canada?

67

→ [IF NO ANSWER: GO TO Q.73]

[70] In what kind of business, industry or service were you working?

68 69

[71] What position or title did you hold last in this job?

70 71 72 73

[72] In which city, province or country did you hold that job?

74 75 76

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

1 2 3
4 5

I.D. Number

Card Number

[73] What was your first full-time occupation in Canada?

6

→ [IF NO ANSWER: GO TO Q.77]

[74] In what kind of business, industry or service were you working?

7 8

[75] What was your position or title at that time?

9 10 11 12

[76] In which city, province, did you hold this job?

13

In Montreal.....1 → [GO TO Q.81]

Other Canadian city.....2

14 15 16

[SPECIFY] City: _____

Province: _____

[77] What was your last full-time occupation before you came to Montreal?

17

→ [IF NO ANSWER: GO TO Q.81]

[78] In what kind of business, industry or service were you working?

18 19

[79] What position did you hold last in this job?

20 21 22 23

[80] In which city and province did you hold that job?

24 25 26

City: _____

Province: _____

27

[81] Are you working full-time now?

Yes.....1

No.....2 → [GO TO Q.99]

DK/NA.....9 → [GO TO Q.99]

[82] What is your present full-time occupation?

→ [IF NO ANSWER: GO TO Q.99]

[83] In what kind of business, industry or service are you working?

[84] What is your present position or title?

[85] How did you get this job?

[86] Are you self-employed, employed, or are you a family worker now?

Self-employed.....1

Employed.....2 → [GO TO Q.90]

Family Worker.....3 → [GO TO Q.91]

DK/NA.....9 → [GO TO Q.95]

[87] Could you tell me roughly how many of your customers are English?

Almost all of them.....1

Nearly three quarters.....2

About one-half.....3

Nearly a quarter.....4

Less than a quarter.....5

DK/NA.....9

[88] How many people do you employ? [Including part-time]

 people
40 41 42 43

[89] How many of them are English-Canadians?

 people → [GO TO Q. 93]
44 45 46 47

[90] Who owns the company, institution, or organization you work with?

48

British or English-Canadian.....1
French or French-Canadian.....2
American or American/Canadian.....3
Jewish or Jewish Canadian.....4
The Government of Canada.....5
The Government of Quebec.....6
Other.....7

[SPECIFY] _____

[91] How many people are employed by the company, institution, or organization you work for?

49

Under 50 people.....1
Between 50 and 100 people.....2
Over 100 people.....3
Over 500 people.....4
DK/NA.....9

[92] What is the ethnic background of the majority of the executive/management of the company, or institution, or organization?

50 51

British or English-Canadian.....1
French or French-Canadian.....2
American or American-Canadian.....3
Jewish or Jewish Canadian.....4
Mixed.....5
Other.....6

[SPECIFY] _____

- [93] Please think about five people, you most closely work with. Could you please tell me the ethnic background of each of them?

52 53 54

55 56

- [94] Do you see any of these people outside of work at social events, for example, dinner?

57 58 59

60 61

Yes.....1

[SPECIFY WHO BY ETHNICITY] _____

No.....2

- [95] What language do you use at work?

[SHOW CARD]

English only.....1

English and some French.....2

Both English and French equally.....3

French and some English.....4

French only.....5

Other.....6

[SPECIFY] _____

DK/NA.....9

- [96] To your knowledge, does the company you work for have a francization program [that is, a program which is designed to aid in the use of the French language in the workplace]?

Yes.....1

No.....2 → [GO TO Q. 98]

DK/NA.....9 → [GO TO Q. 98]

64

[97] Has this program affected you in any way? For example, do you participate in language courses?

65 66 67

Yes.....1

[SPECIFY] _____

No.....2

DK/NA.....9

[98] Have any major changes been made in the organization, personnel or operation of the place where you work during the past year [for example, has your company moved its head office]?

68 69 70

Yes.....1

[SPECIFY] _____

No.....2

DK/NA.....9

[INTERVIEWER SAY TO RESPONDENT]

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR FAMILY.

[99] What is your marital status?

71

Single.....1 → [GO TO Q.147]

Married.....2

Divorced.....3 → [GO TO Q.111]

Widowed.....4 → [GO TO Q.111]

Other.....5 → [GO TO Q.111]

[100] Where did you get married?

72 73 74

Montreal.....1

Other place in Canada.....2

[SPECIFY] _____

Outside Canada.....3

[SPECIFY] _____

DK/NA.....9

[101] How long have you been married?

75 76

_____ years

I.D. Number

1	2	3
0	5	
4	5	

Card Number

[102] Where was your spouse born?

6	7	8
9	10	

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[103] Where did your spouse spend most of his/her life before age 18?

11	12	13
----	----	----

Montreal.....1

Other.....2

[SPECIFY] _____

[104] What is the mother tongue of your spouse?

14	15
----	----

English.....1

French.....2

Other.....3

→ [GO TO Q.106]

[SPECIFY] _____

[105] Does your spouse speak French fluently, nearly fluently, with some difficulty, with a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

16

Fluently.....1

Nearly fluently.....2

With some difficulty.....3

With a lot of difficulty.....4

Not at all.....5

DK/NA.....9

[106] What is the highest diploma or degree your spouse received?

17	18
----	----

None.....00

Elementary/Primary.....01

Secondary/High School.....02

Post High School/C.E.G.E.P.....03

College.....04

Bachelor.....05

Master.....06

Doctor.....07

[SPECIFY] _____

Professional degree.....08

[SPECIFY] _____

Other.....09

[SPECIFY] _____

[107] Is your spouse working full-time now?

19

Yes.....1
No.....2 → [GO TO Q.111]
DK/NA.....9 → [GO TO Q.111]

[108] What is your spouse's present full-time occupation?

20

[109] In what kind of business, industry or service is he/she working?

21 22

[110] What is his/her present position or title?

23 24 25 26

[111] Do you have any children?

27

Yes.....1
No.....2 → [GO TO Q.144]

[112] How many living children do you have?

28 29 30 31

Sons _____
Daughters _____

[113] Do any of your children live away from home?

32

Yes.....1
No.....2 → [GO TO Q.144]

[114] Where does your first son live?

33 34 35

36 37

City: _____
Province: _____
Country: _____

[115] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that he has lived there?

38

Less than 1 year.....1
 1 - 4 years.....2
 5 - 10 years.....3
 More than 10 years.....4
 DK/NA.....9

[116] Where did he live before this [city, town...]?

39 40 41
 42 43

City: _____
 Province: _____
 Country: _____

[IF RESPONDENT HAS ONLY ONE SON: GO TO Q.129]

[117] Where does your second son live?

44 45 46
 47 48

City: _____
 Province: _____
 Country: _____

[118] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that he has lived there?

49

Less than 1 year.....1
 1 - 4 years.....2
 5 - 10 years.....3
 More than 10 years.....4
 DK/NA.....9

[119] Where did he live before this [city, town...]?

50 51 52
 53 54

City: _____
 Province: _____
 Country: _____

[120] Where does your third son live?

55 56 57
 58 59

City: _____
 Province: _____
 Country: _____

[121] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that he has lived there?

60

Less than 1 year.....1
1 - 4 years.....2
5 - 10 years.....3
More than 10 years.....4
DK/NA.....9

[122] Where did he live before this [city, town...]? S

61 62 63

64 65

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[123] Where does your fourth son live?

66 67 68

69 70

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[124] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that he has lived there?

71

Less than 1 year.....1
1 - 4 years.....2
5 - 10 years.....3
More than 10 years.....4
DK/NA.....9

[125] Where did he live before this [city, town...]? S

72 73 74

75 76

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

/ / /
 1 2 3
 / 0 / 6 /
 4 5

I.D. Number

Card Number

[126] Where does your fifth son live?

/ / /
 6 7 8
 / / /
 9 10

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[127] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that he has lived there?

/ /
 11

Less than 1 year.....1

1 - 4 years.....2

5 - 10 years.....3

More than 10 years.....4

DK/NA.....9

[128] Where did he live before this [city, town...]?

/ / /
 12 13 14
 / / /
 15 16

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[FOR RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE DAUGHTERS LIVING ON THEIR OWN]

[129] Where does your only/first daughter live?

/ / /
 17 18 19
 / / /
 20 21

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[130] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that she has lived there?

/ /
 22

Less than 1 year.....1

1 - 4 years.....2

5 - 10 years.....3

More than 10 years.....4

DK/NA.....9

[131] Where did she live before this [city, town...]?

23 24 25

26 27

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[IF RESPONDENT HAS ONLY ONE DAUGHTER: GO TO Q.144]

[132] Where does your second daughter live?

28 29 30

31 32

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[133] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that she has lived there?

33

Less than 1 year.....1
1 - 4 years.....2
5 - 10 years.....3
More than 10 years.....4
DK/NA.....9

[134] Where did she live before this [city, town...]?

34 35 36

37 38

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[135] Where does your third daughter live?

39 40 41

42 43

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[136] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that she has lived there?

44

Less than 1 year.....1
 1 - 4 years.....2
 5 - 10 years.....3
 More than 10 years.....4
 DK/NA.....9

[137] Where did she live before this [city, town...]? .

45 46 47
 48 49

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[138] Where does your fourth daughter live?

50 51 52
 53 54

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[139] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that she has lived there?

55

Less than 1 year.....1
 1 - 4 years.....2
 5 - 10 years.....3
 More than 10 years.....4
 DK/NA.....9

[140] Where did she live before this [city, town...]? .

56 57 58
 59 60

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[141] Where does your fifth daughter live?

61 62 63

64 65

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[142] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that she has lived there?

66

Less than 1 year.....1
1 - 4 years.....2
5 - 10 years.....3
More than 10 years.....4
DK/NA.....9

[143] Where did she live before this [city, town...]?

67 68 69

70 71

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[144] Where do your wife's/husband's parents live?

72 73 74 75

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

→ [IF DECEASED OR NO

ANSWER: GO TO Q.147]

[145] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that they have lived there?

76

Less than 1 year.....1
1 - 4 years.....2
5 - 10 years.....3
More than 10 years.....4
DK/NA.....9

1 2 3

I.D. Number

0 7
4 5

Card Number

[146] Where did they live before this [city, town...]?

6 7 8

9 10

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[147] Where was your father born?

11 12 13

14 15

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[148] What is your father's mother tongue?

16 17

English.....1

French.....2

Other.....3

[SPECIFY] _____

DK/NA.....9

[149] Where was your mother born?

18 19 20

21 22

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[150] What is your mother's mother tongue?

23 24

English.....1

French.....2

Other.....3

[SPECIFY] _____

DK/NA.....9

[151] Where do your parents live?

25 26 27

28 29

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[152] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that they have lived there?

30

Less than 1 year.....1
 1 - 4 years.....2
 5 - 10 years.....3
 More than 10 years.....4
 DK/NA.....9

[153] Where did they live before this [city, town...]?

31 32 33
 34 35

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[154] Do you have any brothers?

36

Yes.....1
 No.....2 → [GO TO Q.170]

[155] Where does your first brother live?

37 38 39
 40 41

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[156] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that he has lived there?

42

Less than 1 year.....1
 1 - 4 years.....2
 5 - 10 years.....3
 More than 10 years.....4
 DK/NA.....9

[157] Where did he live before this [city, town...]?

43 44 45
 46 47

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[158] Where does your second brother live?

48 49 50

51 52

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[159] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that he has lived there?

53

Less than 1 year.....1

1 - 4 years.....2

5 - 10 years.....3

More than 10 years.....4

DK/NA.....9

[160] Where did he live before this [city, town...]?

54 55 56

57 58

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[161] Where does your third brother live?

59 60 61

62 63

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[162] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that he has lived there?

64

Less than 1 year.....1

1 - 4 years.....2

5 - 10 years.....3

More than 10 years.....4

DK/NA.....9

[163] Where did he live before this [city, town...]?

65 66 67

68 69

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

1 2 3
 0 8
 4 5

I.D. Number

Card Number

[164] Where does your fourth brother live?

 6 7 8

 9 10

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[165] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that he has lived there?

 11

Less than 1 year.....1

1 - 4 years.....2

5 - 10 years.....3

More than 10 years.....4

DK/NA.....9

[166] Where did he live before this [city, town...]?

 12 13 14

 15 16

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[167] Where does your fifth brother live?

 17 18 19

 20 21

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[168] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that he has lived there?

 22

Less than 1 year.....1

1 - 4 years.....2

5 - 10 years.....3

More than 10 years.....4

DK/NA.....9

[169] Where did he live before this [city, town...]?

 23 24 25

 26 27

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[170] Do you have any sisters?

28

Yes.....1

No.....2 → [GO TO Q.186]

[171] Where does your only/first sister live?

29 30 31

32 33

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[172] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that she has lived there?

34

Less than 1 year.....1

1 - 4 years.....2

5 - 10 years.....3

More than 10 years.....4

DK/NA.....9

[173] Where did she live before this [city, town...]?

35 36 37

38 39

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[174] Where does your second sister live?

40 41 42

43 44

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[175] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that she has lived there?

45

Less than 1 year.....1

1 - 4 years.....2

5 - 10 years.....3

More than 10 years.....4

DK/NA.....9

[176] Where did she live before this [city, town...]?

46 47 48

49 50

City: _____

Province: _____

Country: _____

[177] Where does your third sister live?

51 52 53

54 55

City: _____
Province: _____
Country: _____

[178] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that she has lived there?

56

Less than 1 year.....1
1 - 4 years.....2
5 - 10 years.....3
More than 10 years.....4
DK/NA.....9

[179] Where did she live before this [city, town...]?

57 58 59

60 61

City: _____
Province: _____
Country: _____

[180] Where does your fourth sister live?

62 63 64

65 66

City: _____
Province: _____
Country: _____

[181] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that she had lived there?

67

Less than 1 year.....1
1 - 4 years.....2
5 - 10 years.....3
More than 10 years.....4
DK/NA.....9

[182] Where did she live before this [city, town...]?

68 69 70

71 72

City: _____
Province: _____
Country: _____

1 2 3
/ 0 / 9
4 5

I.D. Number

Card Number

[183] Where does your fifth sister live?

6 7 8

9 10

City: _____
Province: _____
Country: _____

[184] Could you tell me approximately the number of years that she has lived there?

11

- Less than 1 year.....1
- 1 - 4 years.....2
- 5 - 10 years.....3
- More than 10 years.....4
- DK/NA.....9

[185] Where did she live before this [city, town...]?

12 13 14

15 16

City: _____
Province: _____
Country: _____

[INTERVIEWER SAY TO RESPONDENT]

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE POSITION OF ANGLOPHONES IN QUEBEC.

[186] If an Anglophone does the same work as a Francophone does he get paid more, the same, or less for that work?
[SHOW CARD]

17

- More pay.....1
- Same pay.....2
- Less pay.....3
- DK/NA.....9

[187] Do you think that an Anglophone with the same qualifications as a Francophone can get as good a job, a better job, or not as good a job?

[SHOW CARD]

18

- Better job.....1
- As good a job.....2
- Not as good a job.....3
- DK/NA.....9

[188] Do you feel that Anglophones are discriminated against when they try to get jobs in Québec?

19

Yes.....1
No.....2
DK/NA.....9

[189] Do you think that there is prejudice against Anglophones in Quebec?

[SHOW CARD]

20

Yes, very strong prejudice.....1
Yes, some prejudice.....2
Yes, a little prejudice by a small number....3
No, there is no prejudice.....4
DK/NA.....9

[190] To what extent do you feel that you yourself have been a victim of prejudice because of your membership in a minority group?

[SHOW CARD]

21

To a great extent.....1
More than average.....2
Average.....3
Less than average.....4
Not at all.....5
DK/NA.....9

[191] Do you speak French fluently, nearly fluently, with some difficulty, with a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

22

Fluently.....1
Nearly fluently.....2
With some difficulty.....3
With a lot of difficulty.....4
Not at all.....5
DK/NA.....9

[192] What language do you use at home?

[SHOW CARD]

23 24

English only.....1
English and some French.....2
Both English and French equally.....3
French and some English.....4
French only.....5
Other.....6
[SPECIFY] _____

[193] What language do you use with most of your friends?

[SHOW CARD]

25 26

English only.....1
 English and some French.....2
 Both English and French equally.....3
 French and some English.....4
 French only.....5
 Other.....6

[SPECIFY] _____

[194] What language are the books and magazines you read?

[SHOW CARD]

27 28

English only.....1
 English and some French.....2
 Both English and French equally.....3
 French and some English.....4
 French only.....5
 Other.....6

[SPECIFY] _____

[195] What language do you use in public places, for example in the stores where you shop?

[SHOW CARD]

29 30

English only.....1
 English and some French.....2
 Both English and French equally.....3
 French and some English.....4
 French only.....5
 Other.....6

[SPECIFY] _____

[INTERVIEWER SAY TO RESPONDENT]

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR PLANS FOR THE FUTURE.

[196] Have you considered leaving Quebec to settle elsewhere?

31

Yes, a lot.....1

Yes, a little.....2

No.....3 → [GO TO Q.202]

[197] Have you made definite plans to leave, for example, have you accepted a new job, or found a new place to live?

32

New job and place to live.....1
 New job.....2
 New place to live.....3
 Neither.....4

[GO TO Q.201]

[198] Where are you planning to move?

33 34 35
 36 37

City: _____
 Province: _____
 Country: _____

[199] Why are you going there?

38 39 40
 41 42 43

[200] Are there any persons or groups there who can help you get settled?

44 45

Yes.....1
 [SPECIFY i.e., relative, company..] _____

No.....2 → [GO TO Q.208]

[201] Have you made tentative plans to leave Quebec, such as applying for another job or answering ads for places to live?

46

New job and place to live.....1
 New job.....2
 New place to live.....3
 Neither.....4

[202] Have you read about job possibilities or talked about getting a new job outside Quebec?

47

Yes.....1
 No.....2

[203] Have you travelled outside of Quebec specifically to see if you would like to live elsewhere?

48

Yes.....1
 No.....2

[205] I would like to know the chances of your moving out of Quebec in the next five years. Are you...

[SHOW CARD]

Definitely leaving.....1
Probably leaving.....2
Probably not leaving.....3
Definitely not leaving.....4
DK/NA.....9

[206] If Quebec were to become an independent country, what would be the chances of your moving out of Quebec in the next five years?

[SHOW CARD]

Definitely would leave.....1
Probably would leave.....2
Probably would not leave.....3
Definitely would not leave.....4
DK/NA.....9

[207] If the Parti Québécois were to clearly win the independence referendum, what would be the chances of your moving out of Quebec in the next five years?

[SHOW CARD]

Definitely would leave.....1
Probably would leave.....2
Probably would not leave.....3
Definitely would not leave.....4
DK/NA.....9

[208] If the Parti Québécois were to clearly lose the independence referendum, what would be the chances of your moving out of Quebec in the next five years?

Definitely would leave.....1
Probably would leave.....2
Probably would not leave.....3
Definitely would not leave.....4
DK/NA.....9

- [209] Here is a list of reasons why some people would stay in Quebec. Which would be the most important to you? Which is second in importance? Third? Fourth? Fifth?
[SHOW CARD]

53 54 55

56 57

Personal economic situation or job.....
General economic conditions in Quebec.....
Language laws in Quebec.....
General political conditions in Quebec.....
Friends and relatives here in Quebec.....

- [210] Here is a list of reasons why some people would leave Quebec. Which would be the most important to you? Which is second in importance? Third? Fourth? Fifth?
[SHOW CARD]

58 59 60

61 62

Personal economic situation or job.....
General economic conditions in Quebec.....
Language laws in Quebec.....
General political conditions in Quebec.....
Friends and relatives living outside of Quebec...

- [211] Generally speaking, would you say that in Quebec society at present, things are going very well, rather well, not very well, or not well at all?
[SHOW CARD]

63

Very well.....1
Rather well.....2
Not very well.....3
Not well at all.....4
DK/NA.....9

- [212] How would you rate the state of the Quebec economy? Is it...
[SHOW CARD]

64

Very good.....1
Rather good.....2
Not very good.....3
Not good at all.....4
DK/NA.....9

- [213] Do you think that the state of the Quebec economy can affect your own personal economic situation?

65

Yes, very much so.....1
Yes, a little.....2
No.....3
DK/NA.....9

1 2 3
1 0
4 5

I.D. Number

Card Number

[214] Generally speaking, how do you judge the present provincial government in Quebec? Are you...

[SHOW CARD]

6

Very satisfied with it.....1
Rather satisfied.....2
Not too satisfied.....3
Not at all satisfied.....4
DK/NA.....9

[215] How do you judge the provincial government with regard to its accomplishments in the economic areas? Are you...

[SHOW CARD]

7

Very satisfied with it.....1
Rather satisfied.....2
Not too satisfied.....3
Not at all satisfied.....4
DK/NA.....9

[216] How do you feel about Bill 101, that is, the new French language law adopted this summer by the Quebec government: Are you generally in favour of it or are you generally against it?

8

In favour.....1
Against.....2
DK/NA.....9

[217] With which of the following groups of people do you feel most at ease?

9 10

English Canadians.....1
French Canadians.....2
Jewish Canadians.....3
Other.....4

[SPECIFY]

DK/NA.....9

[218] Please think of three close friends that you have. To what ethnic origin does each of them belong?

11 12 13

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

[219] Please think of your next-door neighbours.
To what ethnic group does each of them belong?

 /
14 15

1. _____
2. _____

[220] How long have you been living in this house/
apartment?

 /
16 17

_____ years

[221] What is the ethnic origin of the majority of your
in-laws? [i.e., your brothers' wives]

 /
18 19

- English-Canadian.....1
French-Canadian.....2
Jewish-Canadian.....3
Mixed.....4
Other.....5

[SPECIFY] _____

DK/NA.....9

[222] In general, do you think English Canadians and
French Canadians can get along... [SHOW CARD]
very easily, fairly easily, with a certain
amount of difficulty, or with a great deal of
difficulty?

20

- Very easily.....1
Fairly easily.....2
With a certain amount of difficulty....3
Great amount of difficulty.....4
DK/NA.....9

[223] Do you think that in their mentality and ways
of living, French Canadians and English Canadians
are... [SHOW CARD] very different, fairly different,
quite similar, or very similar?

21

- Very different.....1
Fairly different.....2
Quite similar.....3
Very similar.....4
DK/NA.....9

[224] In general, do you think English Canadians and Chinese Canadians can get along together... [SHOW CARD] very easily, fairly easily, with a certain amount of difficulty, or with a great deal of difficulty?

22

Very easily.....1
 Fairly easily.....2
 With a certain amount of difficulty...3
 Great amount of difficulty.....4
 DK/NA.....9

[225] Do you think that in their mentality and ways of living, English Canadians and Chinese Canadians are... [SHOW CARD] very different, fairly different, quite similar, or very similar?

23

Very different.....1
 Fairly different.....2
 Quite similar.....3
 Very similar.....4
 DK/NA.....9

[226] In general, do you think that English Canadians and Jewish Canadians can get along together... [SHOW CARD] very easily, fairly easily, with a certain amount of difficulty, or with a great amount of difficulty?

24

Very easily.....1
 Fairly easily.....2
 With a certain amount of difficulty...3
 Great amount of difficulty.....4
 DK/NA.....9

[227] Do you think that in their mentality and ways of living, Jewish Canadians and English Canadians are... [SHOW CARD] very different, fairly different, quite similar, very similar?

25

Very different.....1
 Fairly different.....2
 Quite similar.....3
 Very similar.....4
 DK/NA.....9

[228] Would you be willing to have a French-Canadian as a member of your family by marriage?

[SHOW CARD]

26

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[229] Would you be willing to have a French-Canadian as a close personal friend? [SHOW CARD]

27

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[230] Would you be willing to have a French-Canadian over to your house for supper? [SHOW CARD]

28

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[231] Would you be willing to have a French-Canadian as a person you might visit with? [SHOW CARD]

29

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[232] Would you be willing to have a French-Canadian as a member of one of your social clubs? [SHOW CARD]

30

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[233] Would you be willing to have a French-Canadian as your next-door neighbour? [SHOW CARD]

31

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[234] Would you be willing to have a French-Canadian
as a co-worker? [SHOW CARD]

32

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[235] Would you be willing to have a Chinese-Canadian
as a member of your family by marriage?

[SHOW CARD]

33

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[236] Would you be willing to have a Chinese-Canadian
as a close personal friend? [SHOW CARD]

34

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[237] Would you be willing to have a Chinese-Canadian
over to your house for supper? [SHOW CARD]

35

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[238] Would you be willing to have a Chinese-Canadian
as a person you might visit with? [SHOW CARD]

36

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[239] Would you be willing to have a Chinese-Canadian
as a member of one of your social clubs? [SHOW CARD]

37

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[240] Would you be willing to have a Chinese-Canadian
as your next-door neighbour? [SHOW CARD]

38

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[241] Would you be willing to have a Chinese-Canadian
as a co-worker? [SHOW CARD]

39

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[DO NOT ASK JEWISH RESPONDENTS Q.242-Q.248. GO DIRECTLY
TO Q.249]

[242] Would you be willing to have a Jewish-Canadian
as a member of your family by marriage?

[SHOW CARD]

40

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[243] Would you be willing to have a Jewish-Canadian
as a close personal friend? [SHOW CARD]

41

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[244] Would you be willing to have a Jewish-Canadian
over to your house for supper? [SHOW CARD]

42

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[245] Would you be willing to have a Jewish-Canadian
as a person you might visit with? [SHOW CARD]

43

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[246] Would you be willing to have a Jewish-Canadian
as a member of one of your social clubs?
[SHOW CARD]

44

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[247] Would you be willing to have a Jewish-Canadian
as your next-door neighbour? [SHOW CARD]

45

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[248] Would you be willing to have a Jewish-Canadian
as a co-worker? [SHOW CARD]

46

Very willing.....1
Willing.....2
Not very willing.....3
Not at all willing.....4

[249] What is your religion?

47

[250] Do you attend church?

48

Yes, frequently.....1
Yes, occasionally.....2
No.....3
DK/NA.....9

[251] Is your social position in the community high, low, or the same, in comparison with other individuals in the Montreal community?

49

High.....1
The same.....2
Lower.....3
DK/NA.....9 → [GO TO Q.253]

[252] Could you tell me why you think you are in a... [higher, lower...] social position?

50 51 52

53 54 55

[253] What was approximately your total earnings for 1977 from all sources, including wages, salaries, rents, investments, and contributions made by other members of your family?
[IF NO ANSWER, SEE CARD]

56 57 58

30,000 and over.....1
25,000 - 29,999.....2
20,000 - 24,999.....3
15,000 - 19,999.....4
10,000 - 14,999.....5
5,000 - 9,999.....6
Less than 5,000.....7
DK/NA.....9

[254] Do you belong to any clubs or associations?

59

Yes.....1
No.....2 → [GO TO Q.256]
DK/NA.....9

[255] Could you please tell me about these clubs or associations. Are these:

 / /
60 61 62

Sports and cultural associations.....1
[SPECIFY NAME] _____

Business and professional associations.....2
[SPECIFY NAME] _____

Political groups and Unions.....3
[SPECIFY NAME] _____

Religious associations.....4
[SPECIFY NAME] _____

Other.....5
[SPECIFY NAME] _____

(256) Are you in any way associated with any persons or groups other than relatives who live outside Quebec and could help you settle down if (when) you move away from Quebec?

Yes.....1

(SPECIFY):

	<u>RELATION TO RESPONDENT</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>TYPE OF ASSISTANCE</u>
<u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> 63 64 65	A. _____	_____	_____
<u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> 66 67 68	B. _____	_____	_____
<u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> 69 70 71	C. _____	_____	_____

No.....2

DK/NA.....9

(257) May I ask how old you are?

 / /
72 73

 / /
74 75 76

 / /
77 78 79

 / /
80

_____ years

APPENDIX III

SAMPLING METHODOLOGY

The sampling methodology was designed to form a representative sample of Anglophones living in the Montreal Metropolitan area, within a reasonable time and cost frame.

- Since one of the major concerns of the study was the extent to which Anglophones disassociated themselves from Francophones, and since residence could be considered a key indicator of social distance, it was essential that our sampling method not exclude Anglophones living in predominantly Francophone areas.

The following details the sampling procedure:

1. A list of all telephone exchanges for the Montreal Metropolitan Area was compiled. Assistance in eliminating non-residential numbers from the sampling frame was provided by Bell Canada.
2. A listing was made of approximately 1000 exchanges. Exchanges were repeated based on the proportion of the total Montreal population residing in that exchange (for example, if the '484' exchange contained 8% of the population, 484 was listed 80 times). This method assumed that Anglophones would be randomly distributed across exchanges which, of course, we knew to be untrue. Thus the probability of contacting an Anglo-

phone household was based on the percentage of Anglo-phones residing in the exchange.

A more exact method might have been to establish quotas within each exchange based on the proportion of the English-speaking population residing in each. However, this method would have made more difficult the task of identifying a low-incidence population using a random digit dialing procedure. In fact, the final sample distribution profiled the geographic distribution of Anglophones in the Montreal Metropolitan Area.

3. Exchanges were given randomly-assigned 4 digit numbers and these telephone numbers were entered on screening questionnaires. Five attempts were made to complete the call.

4. When all of the numbers in the listing had been exhausted, the sampling procedure was repeated, in that a second listing of 1000 numbers was prepared. Thus, no one exchange was advantaged by over-sampling.

5. A total of approximately 6000 names was needed to generate the final sample of 332 Anglophones. (A large percentage of numbers were rejected on the basis of out-of-service, non-residential in spite of the initial screening by Bell Canada.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, G.W.,

1954

The Nature of Prejudice, Cambridge, Addison, Wesley.

Balakrishnan, T.R.,

1976

"Ethnic Residential Segregation in the Metropolitan Areas of Canada", Canadian Journal of Sociology, 1-4 [Winter] 481-498.

Barth, Fredrik (ed.),

1969

Ethnic Groups and Boundaries, Boston, Little and Brown.

Beaman, Jay,

1973

"A Framework for Modelling Geographic Mobility with Test Applications to Analysis of Mobility Data for Thirteen Canadian Cities", Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Dept. of Sociology, Cornell University.

Bell, Colin,

1968

Middle Class Families: Social and Geographic Mobility, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bernard, Paul, et al.

1979

L'evolution de la situation socio-economique des Francophones et des non-Francophones au Quebec [1971-1978], l'Editeur Officiel, Quebec.

Beshers, J.M. and E.N. Nishiura,

1961

"A Theory of Internal Migration Differentials",
Social Forces, 39:214-18.

Beshers, J.M., et al.,

1963

"Social Distance Strategies and Status Symbols:
An Approach to the Study of Social Structure",
Sociological Quarterly, 4-4:311-24.

Blishen, B.,

1970

"Social Class and Opportunity in Canada",
Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology,
7-2:110-27.

Bogardus, E.S.,

1926

"Social Distance Between Groups", Journal of
Applied Sociology, 10 [May]:473-9.

1933

"A Social Distance Scale", Sociology and Social
Research 17:265-71.

1959

"Racial Reactions by Regions", Sociology and
Social Research 43-4 [March-April]:286-90.

Bogue, D.,

1969

Principles of Demography, New York, Wiley.

Borjean, Charles M., et al.,

1965

"Continuities in Measurement, 1959-63", Social
Forces 43-4 [May]:532-5.

Boulet, J.-A.

1979

"L'evolution des disparites linguistiques de
revenues de travail dans la zone metropolitaine
de Montreal de 1961-1977". Economic Council
of Canada, Report #127 [February].

Breton, Raymond,

1964

"Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communi-
ties and the Personal Relations of Immigrants",
American Journal of Sociology, LXX, 2:193-205.

Brown, R.L.,

1969

"Social Distance: Jordanian and Israeli Stu-
dents", Sociology and Social Research, 53-3
[April]:344-62.

Caldwell, Gary,

1974

A Demographic Profile of the English-Speaking
Population of Quebec 1921-1971. (International
Centre for Research on Bilingualism, Quebec
Publication B-51.)

1978

Out-Migration of English Mother Tongue High-School
Leavers from Quebec 1971-1976, Lennoxville:
Anglo-Quebec en Mutation at Bishop's University.

Caldwell, Gary and Waddell, Eric,

1982

The English of Quebec, Institut Quebecois de
recherche sur la Culture Quebec.

Charbonneau, H. and Maheu, Robert,

1973

"Les Aspects Demographiques de la Question Linguistique", Commission of Inquiry on the Situation of French and Language Rights in Quebec (Gendron) Synthese 5-3, l'Editeur Officiel, Quebec.

Clark, S.D.,

1976

Canadian Society in Historical Perspective, Toronto, McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Coleman,

1975

"Recent Trends in School Integration".
Educational Researcher, 16:104-119.

Courchène, T.J.,

1970

"Migration, Income and Employment in Canada, 1965-68", C.D. Howe Research Publications.

Darroch, G. and Marston, W.G.,

1971

"The Social Class Basis of Ethnic Residential Segregation: The Canadian Case", American Journal of Sociology, 77:491-510.

Desbarats, Peter,

1965

The State of Quebec, Toronto, McClelland and Stewart.

Defriese, C.H. and Ford, W.S.,

1969

"Verbal Attitudes, Overt Acts and the Influence of Social Contact in Interracial Behaviour",
Social Problems 16:493-504.

Duncan, D. and Duncan, B.,

1955

"A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indexes",
American Sociological Review 20:210-17.

Ellis, R.A.,

1956

"Social Status and Social Distance", Sociology and Social Research 40:240-6.

Fendrich, J.M.,

1967

"Perceived Reference Group Support - Racial Attitudes and Overt Behaviour", American Sociological Review 32:960-9.

Foggin, D. and Polese, M.,

1977

"The Social Geography of Montreal", University of Toronto Working Papers.

Gallaway, Lowell,

1967

"Industry Variations in Geographic Labor Mobility Patterns". Journal of Human Resources, 2 461-474.

Gendron, J.D.,

1977

Language of Work, Book 1: Report of the Commission of Inquiry on the Position of the French Language and on Language Rights in Quebec, Government of Quebec.

1977

The Ethnic Groups, Book 3: Report of the Commission of Inquiry on the Position of the French Language and on Language Rights in Quebec, Government of Québec.

Goyder, John C. and Curtis, J.E.,

1977

"Occupational Mobility in Canada over Four Generations". Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 14: 303-17.

Henripin, J.,

1974

L'Immigration et le déséquilibre linguistique - Ministère de la Main d'œuvre et de l'Immigration.

Hughes, E.C.,

1943

French Canada in Transition, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Jackson, J.D.,

1975

Community and Conflict: A Study of French-English Relations in Ontario, Toronto, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Joy, Richard,

1972

Languages in Conflict, Toronto, McClelland and Stewart.

Kinloch, Graham C.,

1974

"Racial Prejudice in Highly and Less Racist Societies: Social Distance Preferences", Sociology and Social Research 59-1 [October]:1-13.

Ladinsky, J.,

1967

"Source of Geographic Mobility among Professional Workers: A Multivariate Analysis", Demography 4-1: 293-309.

Lange, M., Lipkin, M. and Locher, U.,

1980

"Attitudes versus Behaviour in Intergroup Contact: Understanding the Discrepancy Among Montreal Anglophones", McGill University, Dept. of Sociology. Working Papers in Migration and Ethnicity Nos. 80-1.

LaPierre, Richard,
1934 "Attitudes vs. Action", Social Forces 13 [December]:230-7.

Lee, Everett S.,
1966 "A Theory of Migration", Demography 3:47-57.

Leslie, G. and Richardson, A.,
1961 "Life Cycle, Career Pattern and the Decision to Move", American Sociological Review 26-6.

Lever, H.,
1968 "Ethnic Preferences of White Students in Johannesburg", Sociology and Social Research 52: 157-173.

Levine, Daniel U. and Meyer, J.K.,
1977 "Level and Rate of Disintegration and White Enrollment Decline in a Big City School District", Social Problems 24-4 [April]:451-62.

Lieberson, S.,
1963 Ethnic Patterns in American Cities, New York, Free Press.
1970 Language and Ethnic Relations in Canada, New York, Wiley.

Linn, Lawrence S.,
1965 "Verbal Attitudes and Overt Behaviour: A Study of Racial Discrimination", Social Forces 43: 353-364.

Locher, Uli,

1979

"L'exode des Anglophones de Montreal: nouvelles donnees et nouvelle interpretation", dans La Transformation du Pouvoir au Quebec: Association canadienne des sociologues et anthropologues de langue francaise. Colloque Albert St. Martin.

1983

Conscience linguistique des jeunes Quebecois. Tome III, Tome IV de dossiers du conseil de la langue francaise #13, #14. L'editeur officiel du Quebec.

Long, L.H.,

1972

"The Influence of Numbers and Ages of Children on residential mobility", Demography 9 [August]: 371-82.

Mangalam, J.J. and H.K. Schwarzweller,

1970

"Some Theoretical Guidelines Towards a Sociology of Migration", International Migration Review, 4-2:5-20.

Martin, F.,

1979

Montreal: The Economic Factors, C.D. Howe Research Institute Publication.

McDill, E.C.,

1961

"Anomie, Authoritarianism, Prejudice and Socio-Economic Status: An Attempt at Clarification", Social Forces 39:239-45.

McInnis, Marvin,

1971

"Age, Education and Occupational Differentials
in Interregional Migration: Some Evidence for
Canada", Demography 8:2 [May]:195-204.

Miller, Sheila

1976

"Family Life Cycle, Extended Family Orienta-
tions and Economic Aspirations as Factors in the
Propensity to Migrate", Sociological Quarterly:
17-3 [Summer]:323-35.

Minard, R.D.,

1952

"Race Relationships in the Pocahontas Coal Field",
Journal of Social Issues 8:29-44.

Morrison, Peter,

1967

"Duration of Residence and Prospective Migration:
The Evaluation of a Stochastic Model", Demography
4:553-61.

Nickson, May,

1967

Geographic Mobility of Labour in Canada, Oct.
1964 to Oct. 1965. Special Labour Force Studies,
No. 4, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa,
Queen's Printer.

Noel, D.L. and Pinkney, A.,

1964

"Correlates of Prejudice: Some Racial Differences
and Similarities", American Journal of Sociology
3:609-22.

Ouellet, Fernand,

1964 Histoire économique et sociale du Québec 1760-1850, Montreal, Fids.

Park, R.E.,

1924 "The Concept of Social Distance", Journal of Applied Sociology 8:339-44.

Peterson, W.,

1958 "A General Typology of Migration", American Sociological Review 23 [June]:256-66.

Pines, P., et al.,

1977 "The 1971 Census and the Socioeconomic Classifications of Occupations", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 14-1:91-102.

Porter, John,

1965 The Vertical Mosaic, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

Postgates, Dale and McRoberts, K.,

1976 Quebec: Social Change and Political Crises, Toronto, McClelland and Stewart.

Prothro, E.T. and Melikian, Levon,

1952 "Social Distance and Social Change in the Near East", Sociology and Social Research 37:3-11.

Ravenstein, E.G.,

1889 "The Laws of Migration", Journal of the Royal Statistical Society 52 [June]:241-301.

Raynauld, A., Marion G. and Beland, R.,

1967 "La repartition des revenus selon les groupes ethniques du Canada, Rapport Final". Unpublished manuscript, III A:15-24, 61-86: Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

Richmond, A.,

1969 "Immigration and Pluralism in Canada", International Migration Review 4:5-24.

Rossi, Peter,

1955 Why Families Move: A Study on the Social Psychology of Urban Residential Mobility, Glencove, The Free Press.

Shaw, R. Paul,

1975 Migration Theory and Fact, Bibliographic Series #5, Regional Science Research Institute, New York.

Sjaastad, Larry,

1962 "The Costs and Returns of Human Migration", Journal of Political Economy 70:80-93.

Speare, A., Jr.,

1970 "Home Ownership, Life Cycle Stage and Residential Mobility", Demography 7 [November]:449-57.

1974 "Residential Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable in Residential Mobility", Demography 11 [May]:173-88.

Stein, Michael,

1982 "Changing Anglo-Quebecer Self Consciousness" in The English of Quebec, Institut Québécois de Recherche sur la Culture, 1982.

Stone, Leroy O.,

1969 Migration in Canada: Regional Aspects, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Catalogue #CS-99:54811969.

1970 "What We Know About Migration Within Canada - A Selective Review", International Migration Review [April]:267-81.

1975 "On the Interaction of Mobility Dimensions in Theory of Migration Decisions", Canadian Journal of Sociology and Anthropology 12-1:95-100.

Stouffer, Sam,

1940 "Intervening Opportunities: A Theory Relating Mobility and Distance", American Sociological Review 5-6:845-67.

Tauber, Karl E.,

- 1961 "Duration of Residence Analysis of Internal Migration in the United States", Millbank Memorial Fund Quarterly XXXIX:120.

Tarver, J.P.,

- 1964 "A Micro-Analytic Model of Migration Behaviour", Regional Service Perspectives 3-22.

Van Arsdol, J.R. et al.,

- 1968 "Retrospective and Subsequent Metropolitan Residential Mobility", Demography 5-1:249-67.

Vandercamp, John,

- 1968 "Mobility Behaviour in the Canadian Labour Force", Economic Council of Canada, Special Study No.16, Ottawa.

- 1971 "Migration Flows and Their Determinants and the Effects of Return Migration", Journal of Political Economy, 79 [September-October]:

- 1973 "Inter-regional Mobility in Canada: A Study of the Time-Pattern of Migration", Canadian Journal of Economics 1 [August]:

Weinfeld, Morton,

- 1979 The Jews of Montreal: Determinants of Economic Segregation, Social Segregation and the Propensity to Migrate. Paper presented at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Assoc. Meeting, Saskatoon, June 1-4, 1979.