

THE EFFECTS OF ETHNIC CHARACTERISTICS UPON ORIENTATIONS TOWARDS NATIVE INDIANS

J. RICK PONTING

Department of Sociology,

University of Calgary

and

ROGER GIBBINS

Department of Political Science,

University of Calgary

ABSTRACT/RESUME

Acting on a premise that non-Indian opinion is of some value to research on Indian issues, the authors conducted a survey of non-Indian opinion in 1976. This paper is based upon that survey. It is concerned with the salience of particular ethnic factors of non-Indians to their perspectives of Indians. There appeared to be clear differences of opinions held by Anglo-Canadians and Franco-Canadians, with foreign born Canadians tending to assume the less positive opinions of Anglo-Canadians. The authors propose further research on opinions and beliefs, noting the many facets of life which have influenced non-Indian attitudes, such as religious and political beliefs.

Les auteurs ont effectuée une étude de l'opinion non-indienne en 1976, après avoir admis, comme préalable, qu'une opinion non-indienne peut être de quelque valeur pour la recherche sur les questions indiennes. Cet article est fondé sur cette étude. Il traite de l'importance des facteurs ethniques particuliers aux non-Indiens dans leur perception des Indiens. Ici, apparaissent clairement des différences d'opinion entre les Anglo et Franco-Canadiens, les Canadiens nés à l'étranger ont, en général, tendance à admettre les opinions les moins positives des Anglo-Canadiens. Les auteurs proposent une recherche approfondie sur les opinions et croyances qui ont influencé les attitudes non-indiennes, telles que les croyances religieuses et politiques.

INTRODUCTION

Social science approaches to understanding intergroup relations may be divided into two broad types, namely those which focus upon structural explanatory factors such as social class, labour market conditions, demographic balance, etc., and those which seek explanations in social psychological factors such as perceptions (stereotypes), attitudes, and beliefs (ideologies). Although structural theories have received the bulk of attention during the 1970s, a place still exists for social psychological factors. Indeed, among practitioners in the field of Indian Affairs, the 1980s have witnessed a revival of interest in non-Indians' attitudes and orientations towards Indians.

Examples of that renewed interest are numerous. For instance, in an open letter one of the candidates in the National Indian Brotherhood's 1980 presidential election called for Indians to launch (amongst other things) a national public awareness campaign directed at informing non-Indians about Indians' concerns (Linklater, 1980). On another front, the director of policy in the Indian and Inuit Affairs Programme of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs related to the authors his view that his policy makers have to find a middle ground between what will be acceptable to Indians, on the one hand, and to Parliament and the public on the other hand (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980: 104). A further example is to be found in the remarks of one of Canada's leading ethnic relations specialists and policy researchers, Raymond Breton, who, in a recent workshop on Indian affairs research, cited the evolution of non-Indian attitudes as an aspect of Indian affairs which should receive high research priority as we embark upon the 1980s.

Our own belief that Indians cannot totally disregard non-Indian public opinion if they expect to make headway in Canada's majority-rule political system led us to conduct a nation-wide survey of non-Indians' orientations towards Indians and Indian issues.¹ The present report is one in a number of papers issuing from that 1976 study. In this paper we report on the effects of certain ethnic characteristics upon orientations towards Indians and Indian issues. Ethnic factors have often been salient features of Canadian politics and it is both interesting and useful to begin to map out how those ethnic factors impinge upon what has become the highly politicized realm of

Indian affairs. In particular, at the present moment in history when both Indians and immigrants are seeking a seat at the bargaining table where Canada's very constitution may be hammered out, the views of immigrants vis-a-vis Indians take on added importance.² Finally, we feel that it is also useful to bring these data forth into the public realm not only for purposes of establishing a base line against which future comparisons can be made, but also for purposes of generating hypotheses which can be put to the test in such future studies.

Ours is by no means the first study to examine the relationship between Indians and "ethnics". For instance, both Stymeist's (1975) study of social relations in the small northwestern Ontario town of Sioux Lookout and Berry et al.'s (1976) study of inter-group attitudes in several southern Canadian metropolitan areas found that the ethnicity of individuals is related to the perceptions they held of Native Indians. Berry et al. found these differences among ethnic groups to be quite pronounced, and both Berry et al. and Stymeist found that Indians occupy a distinct position outside the community's regular system of ethnicity. In yet another study Frances Henry (1977) found that racist attitudes varied by respondents' country of origin, although it should be noted that her study dealt with attitudes towards Blacks rather than Indians.

In this paper we concern ourselves with the effects of only certain aspects of ethnicity and immigration, for the main emphases of the larger study were in other directions. The specific ethnic characteristics ("independent variables") whose effects we wish to examine, are the following: (1) place of birth; (2) ethnic origin (on father's side); (3) immigrant generation; and (4) linguistic skills.

Immigrants to Canada may have their orientations towards Indians molded in a number of ways directly related to the immigration experience. First, immigrants bring with them a great deal of attitudinal "baggage", some of which may provide a filter for newly acquired information on Canadian Indians, or which may predispose the individual towards the adoption of particular outlooks. For example, immigrants from Scotland, South Africa, Nigeria and Japan come from very different backgrounds which can hardly fail to affect the way in which they view the conditions, aspirations and behaviours of Canadian Indians. Secondly, the immigration process itself may shape attitudes. Individuals who have themselves

been thrust into a minority position through the act of immigration may thereby gain an enhanced sensitivity to, and empathy for, the position of other minority groups, such as Canadian Indians. Conversely, the immigrant may feel that if he or she can successfully assimilate into the Canadian society, there is no reason why other minorities, such as Indians, cannot do so as well (Stymeist, 1975:9). In this case, immigrants may prove to be particularly resistant to any Indian claims for special status or preferential treatment.

Although the foregoing examples provide an illustration of the general tenor of our interest in the subject matter at hand, they do not specify what concrete indicators we shall use to capture nonIndians' orientations towards Indians. Otherwise stated, we need to identify a set of "dependent variables" and show how we measured them. This we do below.

Our interview questionnaire contained over one hundred different questions which could be used here. In order to simplify, and hence clarify, the discussion we have selected only six topic areas which together encompass a broad range of orientations towards Indians and Indian affairs. Within those six topic areas we have further selected only those variables which are amenable to being classified as indicating a positive or a negative orientation towards Indians. These are described further in Table 1.

METHODOLOGY

Data were collected in early 1976 by means of in-home interviews with 1,832 individuals who were selected by a multi-staged, entirely random sampling procedure. Eligible respondents lived across Canada but south of the sixtieth parallel of latitude and not on an Indian reserve. Interviews, which averaged over forty-five minutes in length, were conducted in the language (English or French) of the respondent's choice, with 1,512 being completed in English and 320 in French. The methodology of the study is described in more detail elsewhere (Gibbins and Ponting, 1980:71-2).

When national opinion studies are conducted in Canada the sample size is often less than two-thirds that of ours. However, even with the large number of respondents in our survey, we still face some severe difficulties arising from small numbers of certain types of respondents. Thus, in the discussion that follows the exclusion of

TABLE I: MEASURES OF RESPONDENTS' ORIENTATIONS TOWARDS INDIANS

TOPIC AREA	INDICATOR USED TO MEASURE A GROUP'S ORIENTATION ON THIS TOPIC	POSSIBLE RANGE		COMMENTS	REFERENCES
		HIGHLY UNFAVOURABLE	HIGHLY FAVOURABLE		
SALIENCE a. Priority attached to Indians (and Inuit)	Respondents were presented with a list of "five problems facing Canada today" and asked to rank the problems in order of importance. Indicator is the percent citing "The social and economic problems of Canada's Indians and Eskimos," as being among their top three priorities in the list. ¹	1	5	This question was the first question in the interview, and as such was posed before respondents realized that the interview would focus on Indians.	
b. Knowledge about Indian Affairs	A composite index formed from replies to six different questions, Indicator is the average score on this composite index,	6	18	This and I.a above are perhaps the two most general types of indicators of a person's orientations towards a social object.	Ponting and Gibbins (1980: Appendix 'A')
II. SYMPATHY TOWARDS INDIANS	Replies to ten different questions were combined to form an index of respondents' general level of receptivity to Indian claims,	10	50	Statistical tests of scalability were applied to eliminate items to which	Ponting and Gibbins (1980: 84-85).

aspirations, and grievances,
Indicator is the average score
on this index,

responses were not
sufficiently correlated with
other items in the index.

III. PERCEPTIONS
OF INDIANS

a. Personality differences	The percentage of respondents citing personality characteristics (such as laziness and lack of ambition) in response to a question asking what are the main differences between Native Indians and other Canadians.	100%	0%
b. Alcohol	The percentage of respondents citing alcohol-related problems in response to a question asking what are the main problems faced by Canadian Indians today.	100%	0%

IV. SPECIAL
CULTURAL
PROTECTION

Percent agreeing strongly or moderately with the statement "Indians, as the first Canadians, should have special cultural protection that other groups don't have."	0%	100%
---	----	------

This statement is one of the items in the sympathy index cited in II above. It bears directly upon Indians' claim to a status as "citizens plus" .

V. LAND CLAIMS VALIDITY	Percent responding "all" or "many" when asked whether they thought that "all", "many", "few" or "none" of Indians land claims are valid.	0%	100%	The special relationship between the people and the land is a hallmark of many Indian cultures. Land claims have been a focal point of much Indian protest and for much media coverage of Indian affairs. In many cases land claims represent a cornerstone of Indians' hopes for future development.
VI. PROTEST APPROVAL	Average score on Tactical Assertiveness Approval Index. This index is based upon respondents' expressed degree of approval or disapproval of Indians actually using seven different protest tactics which cover a broad range of militancy.	10	50	Ponting and Gibbins (1981).

NOTES:

1. The other four problems included in the list were: (1) greater independence of Canada from the U.S.A.; (2) the rights of women in Canada; (3) conservation of energy, and (4) inflation.

regional and socio-economic controls, the collapsing of certain coding categories (e.g., Eastern Europe as country of birth, rather than Poland, Romania, etc.), and the lack of statistical tests of significance will frequently be necessitated by the small number of cases involved. When this happens the findings reported should be treated very cautiously, and should be considered suggestive, rather than definitive.

In this report, differences between anglophone and francophone orientations towards Indians will not be considered at length, as they have been discussed elsewhere (Ponting and Gibbins, 1981; Ponting and Gibbins, 1980, Chapter 3). Our primary focus will instead be upon ethnic differences within the anglophone community. These latter differences, however, must be interpreted against the backdrop of patterns in the broader anglophone community and francophone community. For example, we shall want to know whether the orientations of non-French ethnic minorities towards Indians are similar to those of the French Canadians (who, from a strictly demographic and non-constitutional perspective, can be viewed as another ethnic minority), whether their orientations are similar to the numerically dominant English Canadian society's, or whether they stand apart from both cultural mainstreams in Canada in their orientations towards Indians.

ANALYSIS

A. Place of Birth (Canadian vs Foreign)

In the beginning the analysis we first wish to examine the very broad distinction between respondents born in Canada and those born outside the country. Eighty-four percent (1546 respondents) of our national sample was born in Canada while 16% (286 respondents) was born outside the country. We broke the Canadian-born respondents into anglophone and francophone subsamples, a precaution necessitated by the substantial anglophone-francophone differences which repeatedly appear in orientations towards Indians. Thus, we are concerned with the contrasts in orientations among three groups, foreign-born respondents, anglophone Canadian-born respondents and francophone Canadian-born respondents.

Turning first to comparisons between the foreign-born and the Anglo Canadian-born respondents, we find in Table 2 that foreign-

TABLE 2: EFFECTS OF RESPONDENTS' PLACE OF BIRTH UPON ORIENTATIONS TOWARDS INDIANS

DEPENDENT VARIABLE	PLACE OF BIRTH		
	FRENCH CANADA	ENGLISH CANADA	OUTSIDE CANADA
I. Priority and Knowledge			
a. % citing "the social and economic problems of Canada's Indians and Eskimos" as being among their top three priorities in the list of "five problems facing Canada today"	40	52	57
b. Average score on Knowledge Index	9.15	10.18	9.91
2. Sympathy			
- Average score on Sympathy Index	35.23	31.23	32.11
3. Perceptions			
- % citing			
i. Personality differences (eg. laziness) as a main difference between Indians and other Canadians	8	27	26
ii. Alcohol as a main problem of Indians	3	19	22
4. Culture			
To agreeing strongly or moderately that Indians should have special cultural protection other groups don't have	54	41	45
5. Land Claims			
- % saying that "all" or "many" Indian land claims are valid	79	53	53
6. Protest			
- Average score on Tactical Assertiveness Approval Index	28.22	27.51	25.91

born respondents assigned a higher priority to Indian/Inuit socio-economic problems, but were less receptive to Indians engaging in protest activities. The other differences between these two groups of respondents were not significant.

In sharp contrast, striking differences emerge when we compare foreign-born respondents with Franco Canadian-born respondents. Indeed, these large differences are found for all of the topic areas in Table 2, except that of Knowledge. In comparison with Franco Canadian-born respondents, our foreign-born respondents attach higher priority to Indian/Inuit socio-economic problems, but are also less sympathetic towards Indians, more likely to hold pejorative stereotypes, less likely to be willing to grant Indians special cultural protections, less likely to grant the validity of Indian land claims, and finally, less receptive to Indian protest.

It should be stressed, however, that our distinction between foreign-born and Canadian-born respondents is a crude one. One difficulty, to which we alluded earlier, is the fact that the foreign-born respondents came to Canada from a wide variety of social environments with marked differences in cultural orientations towards minority groups. These we should expect to influence our foreign-born respondents' orientations towards Native peoples in Canada. Indeed, to assume otherwise is to posit an unrealistically strong process of assimilation. Thus, it is appropriate to differentiate between our foreign-born respondents from different countries. However, as indicated earlier, we are burdened with the problem of having only a small number of respondents from some countries. This problem is such that respondents from some countries will have to be excluded from the analysis. Furthermore, there are not statistical grounds for assuming that several of the remaining ethnic subsamples accurately represent their counterparts in the Canadian population as a whole. Thus, the comparisons among groups of foreign-born respondents, to which we now turn, must be treated as *suggestive only*.

The column in Table 3 labelled "Range" shows that for all of the listed dependent variables except Knowledge about Indian matters, there is a considerable discrepancy between the highest and the lowest country. In an attempt to summarize this detailed table, we have shown at the bottom the average rank which each ethnic subsample obtained across all eight of the dependent

TABLE 3: EFFECTS OF ETHNIC ORIGIN (MEASURED IN TERMS OF RESPONDENT'S COUNTRY OF BIRTH) UPON ORIENTATIONS TOWARDS INDIANS

Dependent Variables*	COUNTRY OF BIRTH															Range	
	Fr. Cda.		Eng. Cda.		Grt. Britain		U.S.A.		Germany		Other West Europe		East Eur.		Afr./ W. Indies		
	%	X Rank	%	X Rank	%	X Rank	%	X Rank	%	X Rank	%	X Rank	%	X Rank	%		X Rank
Priority	40	(8)	52	(6)	62	(4)	67	(3)	41	(7)	69	(2)	52	(5)	71	(1)	40-71
Knowledge	9.2	(6)	10.2	(2)	10.9	(1)	9.9	(3)	9.9	(4)	9.7	(5)	9.0	(7)	8.8	(8)	8.8-10.9
Sympathy	35.2	(2)	31.2	(7)	33.7	(3)	31.3	(6)	31.9	(4)	31.5	(5)	29.0	(8)	37.3	(1)	29.0-37.3
Negative Stereotyping																	
a. Laziness, etc.	8	(2)	27	(5)	18	(3)	24	(4)	29	(6)	45	(8)	34	(7)	6	(1)	6-45
b. Alcohol problems	3	(1)	19	(4)	18	(3)	29	(8)	19	(5)	22	(6)	27	(7)	13	(2)	3-29
Special Cultural Protection	54	(1)	41	(6)	50	(3)	43	(5)	36	(8)	38	(7)	47	(4)	55	(2)	36-55
Land Claims Validity	79	(1)	55	(4)	62	(5)	50	(6)	52	(5)	55	(8)	44	(7)	75	(2)	35-79
Protest Approval	28.2	(2)	27.5	(5)	26.3	(5)	25.1	(7)	26.9	(4)	25.5	(6)	24.0	(8)	29.9	(1)	24.0-29.9
Average Rank**	2		4		3		5		6		7		8		1		
N=1810	353		1186		74		39		22		52		67		17		

NOTES: * For full information as to the precise referent of each of the dependent variables see Table 1.
 • *On each dependent variable the highest rank (1) is assigned to the ethnic subsample exhibiting the most favourable orientation towards Indians. A favourable orientation is represented by high mean scores on the three composite indices, low incidences of citing the negative stereotypes, and high incidences opposite the remaining variables.

variables except Knowledge about Indian matters, there is a considerable discrepancy between the highest and the lowest country. In an attempt to summarize this detailed table, we have shown at the bottom the average rank which each ethnic subsample obtained across all eight of the dependent variables. Those average rank scores reveal our respondents from Africa and the West Indies to be the most favourably oriented towards Indians, with French Canadians following closely. At the other end of the continuum are the Eastern Europeans, who with an equal degree of consistency, adopt negative orientations towards native Indians.

Before attempting to explain these findings, we pause to approach from a slightly different perspective this question of the impact which a person's specific ethnic background has upon his/her orientations towards Indians.

B. Ethnic Origin

The Census of Canada measures a person's ethnic origin in terms of the country of origin of the person's father. If we were to use this (admittedly sexist) indicator of ethnicity, and obtain similar findings to those above, those above findings could be viewed in less tentative terms. Statistically such an approach is also attractive in that in comparison with respondents themselves, twice as many of the respondent's fathers are born outside the country (16% vs 33%, respectively). One consequence of this is that we can use a somewhat more refined breakdown of ethnic origin categories, without encountering numerous instances where there is an insufficient number of respondents in a category to permit meaningful statistical analysis. Thus, the results should be less prone to random sampling fluctuations and statistically we should be able to place more confidence in them.

We proceeded with this approach and were thereby able to form twelve categories of ethnic origin, which are shown in Table 4 along with the appropriate percentage or mean score for each on each of the eight dependent variables used in Table 3. Comparing the two tables in terms of the results summarized in the row labelled "Average Rank", the different ethnic origin categories emerge in the following rank orders in the respective tables:

TABLE 4: EFFECTS OF ETHNIC ORIGIN (MEASURED IN TERMS OF FATHER'S COUNTRY OF BIRTH) UPON ORIENTATIONS TOWARDS INDIANS

Dependent Variables*	French Canada	English Canada	Great Britain	U.S.A.	Germany	Africa W. Indies	Poland	USSR, Ukraine	Other E. Europe	South Europe	Scandinavia	Other W. Europe
Priority	40	53	57	54	47	65	31	51	57	43	61	60
Knowledge	9.14	10.17	10.50	10.39	9.94	8.94	8.72	9.95	8.89	9.33	10.13	10.27
Sympathy	35.24	31.25	32.77	29.79	30.84	36.41	28.92	30.10	30.87	35.87	31.51	31.27
Negative Stereotyping												
a. Laziness, etc.	8	25	24	34	32	6	42	30	33	13	42	41
b. Alcohol Problems	4	18	20	24	27	19	39	21	13	22	36	18
Special Cultural Protection	54	39	52	40	39	40	26	38	55	47	46	43
Land Claims Validity	79	54	58	51	39	69	43	45	59	61	53	37
Protest Approval	28.12	27.77	26.86	26.06	24.90	31.10	25.24	26.20	24.03	26.95	27.08	25.76
Average Rank	2	5	3	9	11	1	12	10	6.5	4	6.5	8
N=1810	349	871	220	61	32	17	39	87	35	21	23	55

*For full information as to the precise referent of each of the dependent variables see Table 1.

group consciousness".

The results in Table 4, where the East European ethnic origin category of Table 3 is differentiated into three separate categories, suggest that the unfavourable orientations of Eastern European respondents are mainly attributable to the respondents of Soviet, Ukrainian, and Polish origin, particularly the latter. These dispositions on the part of the Poles become quite understandable when one considers the background of Polish immigration to Canada, to which we briefly turn now.³

According to Matejko and Matejko (1974:42) for centuries the nobility constituted a numerically large component of Polish society and had an enormous and persisting influence on Polish culture. Thus, Polish culture has tended to look down upon peasants and to place very high value upon personal courage, honour, soldiering, determination in the face of adversity, and national pride. In addition, the Matejkos (1974:48) note that among post-World War II Polish immigrants to Canada there is a heavy emphasis placed upon adaptation, on making "their way in the world in spite of an antagonistic environment." Indeed, many in that wave of Polish immigrants (e.g. professionals and skilled tradesmen) experienced severe downward occupational mobility as they left urban areas in Poland to work at what for them was degrading manual farm labour in Canada. They tended to leave the farms and migrate to the cities as quickly as possible, where they injected new organizational and cultural vitality into the Polish-Canadian community.

In many respects Canadian Indians, as perceived by Polish Canadians, are an affront to these aforementioned values and experiences of Polish Canadians. Table 4 shows that these Polish Canadian respondents are particularly likely to perceive Indians as lazy or lacking in ambition, and as having alcoholism problems. Such alleged behaviours by Indians are probably seen by Polish Canadian respondents as reflecting a lack of courage, lack of pride, lack of determination in the face of a hostile environment, lack of adaptive capacity, and a lack of applying oneself to the task of revitalizing the ethnic community. It appears to us that in similar fashion to what Stymeist (1975:8-11) found in his anthropological study in Sioux Lookout, Ontario, our Polish Canadian respondents believe that Indians could be "successful" (that is, upwardly mobile out of their subordinate status) if only they would be willing to exert the

requisite personal effort. The aforementioned findings from Table 4 pertaining to laziness and alcoholism suggest that our Polish Canadian respondents therefore blame Indians for their own subordination. This apparent violation of fundamental values of Polish Canadian culture on the part of Indians may result in a negative reaction which permeates these respondents' orientations on the other dependent variables examined here. Finally, it is interesting to note that when the Poles, the Ukrainians, and those whose fathers are from elsewhere in the U.S.S.R. are removed from the Eastern European category, that category takes on a much more favourable stance towards Indians. This reflects the heterogeneity of the constituent groups comprising the East European classification in Table 3 (e.g., the Czechs have traditionally been considered ideologically more liberal than the Poles or even the Slovaks).

We do not wish to push such cultural explanations to the point where we ourselves engage in inaccurate stereotyping. Nonetheless, certain characteristics commonly attributed to American, German, and British culture (i.e., individualism, authoritarianism, and support for the "underdog", respectively) do readily suggest themselves and should not be overlooked as partial explanations of the respective rankings taken by these groups in Tables 3 and 4.

C. Immigrant Generation

Sociological studies of ethnic groups have found significant generational differences in the experiences of immigrants. A common finding, for instance, is that the first generation of immigrants attempts to retain and emphasize its ethnicity, whereas their children (the second generation) attempt to forget their ethnicity, while the grandchildren (the third generation) sometimes attempt to revive their ethnicity. Given this potential variability in the strength of ethnic attachments across the generations, it is worthwhile to explore here the possibility of generational effects in orientations towards Indians.

In approaching this topic we isolated three generational groups of respondents, as follows:

- first generation respondents, who were born outside Canada and whose parents were born outside Canada (N=269)
- second generation respondents, who were born in Canada but

TABLE 5: GENERATIONAL EFFECTS IN ORIENTATIONS TOWARDS INDIANS

DEPENDENT VARIABLE	GENERATION		
	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD (OR SUBSEQUENT)
1. Priority and Knowledge			
a. % citing "the social and economic problems of Canada's Indians and Eskimos" as being among their top three priorities in the list of "five problems facing Canada today"	57	49	49
b. Average score on Knowledge Index	9.89	10.03	9.82
2. Sympathy			
- Average score on Sympathy Index	32.11	31.38	32.20
3. Perceptions			
- % citing			
* i. Personality differences (eg. laziness) as a main difference between Indians and other Canadians	26	31	21
* ii. Alcohol as a main problem	21	24	14
4. Culture			
% agreeing strongly or moderately that Indians should have special cultural protection other groups don't have	45	45	43
5. *Land Claims			
- % saying that "all" or "many" Indian land claims are valid	54	53	62
6. *Protest			
- Average score on Tactical Assertiveness Approval Index	26.06	26.32	27.98

*Statistically significant at the .01 level or better.

whose parents were both born outside the country (N=240)

- third (or subsequent) generation respondents who were born in Canada and whose parents were also born in Canada (N=1132)⁴

Table 5 shows the orientations towards Indians taken by each generational subsample on each dependent variable. A scan across all three categories of the independent variable reveals what appear to be numerous noteworthy differences, with at least one generational subsample standing apart on all but two variables (knowledge about Indian matters, and the opinion that Indians should receive special cultural protection). We attempted to substantiate these appearances by applying conventional statistical tests of the significance of difference in distributions.⁵ The results of these tests indicated that some of the aforementioned appearances were deceiving. Indeed, this detailed statistical comparison of the generations revealed no statistically significant differences between the first and second generation subsamples on any of the dependent variables, but several differences between the second and third generation subsamples and between the first and third generation subsamples. Overall, these differences tended to point to the third generation respondents as having the most favourable or most facilitating orientation towards Indians.

To ascertain whether this tendency on the part of the third generation respondents held for both Anglophones and Francophones, we repeated the analysis removing the Francophones.⁶ The result of this was to eliminate most of the distinctiveness of the third generation subsample. The noteworthy exceptions to this trend occurred on the perceptual variables and the protest approval variable for the second-third generation comparison, and on that same protest approval variable for the first-third generation comparison.

D. Bilingualism

In Canada, and with particular reference to English-French relations, the ability to speak more than one language is commonly heralded as an indicator, and perhaps a cause, of greater tolerance and understanding of minority group concerns. Bilingualism, by exposing the individual to intergroup cultural differences, is thought to carry with it a greater appreciation of the value of different groups to Canada, the bilingual individual also is thought to have a firmer

grasp and a richer perspective upon the difficulties that minority groups face. Conversely, the unilingual individual is thought to lack the enrichment and understanding that intimate contact with another language and culture brings. Thus, for example, the unilingual Calgarian is denied the sensitivity to English-French relations that might be possessed by someone growing up in a bilingual environment, or by someone who has had his or her linguistic horizons expanded by a second language training programme.

It is, admittedly, less evident that bilingualism should sensitize individuals to Indian issues in the same way in which it might to issues of national unity involving English Canada and French Canada. Nevertheless, the hypothesis can be advanced that the sensitizing effects which bilingualism creates in the one realm of intergroup relations will be extended to that realm of intergroup relations involving Indians and non-Indians.

To examine the relationship between bilingualism and orientations towards Indians, we first divided the sample into three subsamples--respondents who spoke only English, respondents who spoke only French, and respondents who spoke more than one language well enough to carry on a conversation.⁸ As Table 6 shows, we found that across the several orientations being considered in this report, there was only one substantial difference (re: land claims) between bilingual respondents and unilingual Anglophone respondents.

In contrast, both the unilingual Anglophones and the bilinguals differed substantially from the unilingual Francophones. Compared to these other two subsamples, the unilingual Francophones were more sympathetic, less prone to holding negative stereotypes, and so forth (see Table 6). These data show, then, that bilinguals as a group are not distinguishable from unilingual Anglophones. It is actually unilingual Francophones, rather than bilinguals, who stand apart. Thus, the hypothesis that bilingualism per se carries in its wake a greater empathy for Indians and Indian concerns is not substantiated by the data.

In the above discussion we have merged two very different sets of bilinguals--English-French bilinguals and bilingual individuals who cannot hold a conversation in French (English-other bilinguals). As it turns out, there are sharp and systematic differences between the

TABLE 6: EFFECTS OF BILINGUALISM UPON ORIENTATIONS TOWARDS INDIANS

DEPENDENT VARIABLE	LINGUISTIC FACILITY		
	ENGLISH ONLY	FRENCH ONLY	BILINGUAL (ANY COMBINATION)
1. Priority and Knowledge			
a. % citing "the social and economic problems of Canada's Indians and Eskimos" as being among their top three priorities in the list of "five problems facing Canada today"	54	38	49
b. Average score on Knowledge Index	10.21	8.48	9.91
2. Sympathy			
- Average score on Sympathy Index	31.33	36.60	32.18
3. Preceptions			
- % citing			
i. Personality differences (eg. laziness) as a main difference between Indians and other Canadians	26	9	23
ii. Alcohol as a main problem of Indians	19	1	18
4. Culture			
% agreeing strongly or moderately that Indians should have special cultural protection other groups don't have	41	60	44
5. Land Claims			
- % saying that "all" or "many" Indian land claims are valid	53	80	61
6. Protest			
- Average score on Tactical Assertiveness Approval Index	27.39	28.11	27.14

two sets, and between each and unilingual respondents. While bilingualism per se has little impact on orientations towards Indians, the particular type of bilingualism clearly does.

Turning first to the English-French bilinguals, it has been frequently asserted by nationalists in Quebec that bilingualism serves as a stepping stone to assimilation into the English Canadian culture. In this respect it is pointed out that the majority of bilinguals in Canada are native Francophones (a fact reflected in our sample) and that, in practice, bilingualism means the adoption of English as a working language. If we accept the proposition that bilingualism fosters assimilation, what are the implications for the present analysis?

We have noted frequently that English and French-speaking Canadians differ considerably in their orientations towards Indians and Indian issues. Thus, with respect to the impact of English-French bilingualism, we should anticipate a convergence of English and French orientations. To the extent that bilingual Francophones have become assimilated into the English Canadian culture, they should have become less sympathetic towards Indian aspirations, less supportive of Indian claims, and so forth. However, having an attitudinal and linguistic foot still planted in the French Canadian culture, they should remain more sympathetic, and more supportive, than unilingual Anglophones. Conversely, Anglophone bilinguals should, through their linguistic exposure to the French Canadian culture, have become more sympathetic and more supportive than their unilingual Anglophone counterparts. They will not, however, have shed the English Canadian culture to such an extent that they mirror the orientations of unilingual Francophones. Thus, whether bilingualism is leading to partial assimilation into either the English Canadian or French Canadian cultures, the prediction is the same—that English-French bilinguals should be intermediate in their orientations towards Indians and Indian issues, falling somewhere between unilingual Anglophones and unilingual Francophones.

In some respects, the case of English-other bilinguals is similar to that of English-French bilinguals, for here too bilingualism may be indicative of ongoing and as of yet incomplete socialization into the English Canadian cultural mainstream. In this sense, a third-generation German-Canadian who lacks the ability to converse in German would be more acculturated than a second-generation German-

Canadian who had that ability. More importantly, however, English-other bilingualism may be indicative of a relatively strong attachment to the minority group (minority within the Canadian context) from which the language other than English derives.

Such a minority group attachment may act on orientations towards Indians in one of two ways. Conceivably, it could forge a common minority group bond or identification with Indians, thus making English-other bilinguals more sensitive and sympathetic towards Indians. More likely, however, is the prospect that individuals who are themselves undergoing a process of assimilation into the English Canadian society will be relatively unsympathetic to a claim by another ethnic group for exemption from that process. To put the argument in its bluntest form, we contend that individuals with linguistic minority group ties will be relatively unsympathetic towards the claims and aspirations of Canadian Indians and will be unwilling to recognize a special status for Indians when the possibility does not exist for other ethnic groups. Our prediction, then, is that English-other bilinguals should have less favourable orientations towards Canadian Indians than those held by unilingual Anglophones.

Figure 1 presents the mean and/or percentage scores for the five linguistic subsamples on our measures of orientations towards Indians. The prediction that the orientations towards Indians held by English-French bilinguals will be intermediate between unilingual Anglophones and unilingual Francophones is supported by the data for seven of the eight dependent variables in Figure 1. (The exception this time is the variable dealing with the priority of Indian/Inuit socioeconomic problems).

These trends are captured well in the case of the dependent variable involving the validity of Indian land claims and we shall use it to illustrate the aforementioned patterns. We observe that 81% of the unilingual Francophones were of the opinion that "all" or "many" Indian land claims are valid, while only 53% of the unilingual Anglophones were of that opinion. When we separate the bilingual subsample (61% of which was observed in Table 6 to hold that same opinion) into its English-French and English-other components, we note that the percentage of English-French bilinguals holding this opinion jumps (from 61%) to 77%, which is close to that of the unilingual Francophones. On the other hand, the

FIGURE 1: Scores of Unilingual, Bilingual, and Trilingual Respondents Upon Selected Indicators* Of Orientations Towards Indians

KEY: E & O = English, plus other
 UE = Unilingual English
 EF = English and French
 UF = Unilingual French

* For full information as to the precise referent of each of the dependent variables, see Table 1.

PRIORITY		35		40		45		50		55		
%			UF			E&O	EF	UE				
KNOWLEDGE	Low		8		9		10		11	High		
(Mean Scores)	Knowledge			UF		E&O	EF	UE		Knowledge		
SYMPATHY	Low	30	31	32	33	54	35	36	37	High		
(Mean Scores)	Sympathy	E&O	UE			EF			UF	Sympathy		
NEGATIVE STEREOTYPING		5	10	15	20	25	30	35				
(Personality Deficiencies) (%)			UF	EF			UE	E&O				
NEGATIVE STEREOTYPING		0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35			
(Alcohol Problems) (%)		UF		EF		UE	E&O					
SPECIAL CULTURAL		30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65			
PROTECTION (%)				E&O	UE	EF		UF				
LAND CLAIMS		35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85
VALIDITY (%)				E&O	UE					EF	UF	
PROTEST APPROVAL	Dis-	25		26		27		28		29	Approval	
(Mean Scores)	approval	E&O				UE	UF	EF				

percentage of the English-other bilinguals answering "all" or "many", falls (from 61%) to 44%, which is markedly lower than that of the unilingual Anglophone subsample. Thus, the two bilingual groups are very different from one another, and the difference corresponds to the general model which we advanced.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

As a mere adjunct to a larger project, the foregoing inquiry has been guided by intellectual curiosity and by intuition, rather than by formal theory or by pressing policy issues. In light of this fact and of the limitations of the data, it would be pretentious to try to force the results into a grand theoretical scheme or use them as a basis from which to argue for some major policy or programme thrust. Instead, we shall merely summarize our main findings and offer some reflections both on what might be some useful research directions to pursue a propos our topic and on the larger realm of relations between Native Indians and the so-called "other ethnics" (nonAnglo, non-Franco).

We first examined the effect of place of birth upon respondents' orientations towards Indians, and clearly found that foreign-born respondents hold a less favourable orientation towards Indians than do French Canadians, but that those same foreign-born persons hold very similar orientations to those held by Anglo-Canadian born respondents. That foreign-born respondents take on the attitudinal colouration of English Canada should not be surprising, inasmuch as the majority of them- have settled in an English Canadian milieu. Interestingly, though, whereas Berry et al. found that Francophones displayed the most negative evaluations of non-Anglo, non-Franco ethnic groups, we found Francophones to display the most positive orientations towards Indians. This may be able to be explained in part by the timing of the data collection in the two studies. That is, the Berry et al. study was conducted at a time when such "other ethnics" were widely perceived as a threat to French Quebecers, whereas our study was conducted after the signing of the James Bay Agreement, which Agreement may have removed any element of perceived threat which Indians posed to French Quebecers.

The next step in our analysis involved breaking down the category "foreign-born" into several different specific countries or

geographical parts of the globe. Here we found considerable variations by country, with respondents from Africa and the West Indies being particularly favourably oriented towards Indians and Eastern Europeans being notably negative in their orientations towards Indians. We next attempted to ascertain whether similar findings would be obtained under statistically more robust conditions. Thus, instead of grouping our respondents by their own specific country of birth, we grouped them according to their ethnic origin which we defined as being their father's country of birth. Working with these larger numbers of respondents in each category, we obtained results which were strikingly similar to those obtained using respondents' own country of birth, thus giving us more confidence in those results. Those results also paralleled, in several respects (e.g., un-favourable orientations of Eastern Europeans), Frances' findings on attitudes towards Blacks.

After offering explanations for some of those findings we turned to examine whether first, second, and third (or later) generation immigrants tended to hold different orientations towards Indians. Here we found no systematic change from first to second to subsequent generations. The first and second generations in our sample are definitely not distinct in their orientations, and the distinctively more positive or facilitating orientation towards Indians exhibited by the third generation was, with a few noteworthy exceptions, found to be attributable to the influence of the Francophones.

Finally we examined the influence of individual bilingualism upon orientations towards Indians. Here we were particularly interested in any sensitizing effect vis-a-vis Indians which bilingualism might foster. We found that bilingualism per se was not associated with orientations towards Canadian Indians. However, a more refined analysis which took into account the type of bilingualism (that is, the specific language pairs involved) revealed that specific types of bilingualism repeatedly exhibited characteristic sensitizing or desensitizing effects. For instance, English-French bilinguals tend to fall in an intermediate position between the orientations of unilingual Anglophone and unilingual Francophone respondents, while English-other bilinguals generally have less positive orientations towards Indians than does the unilingual Anglophone population.

Turning now to suggestions for future research, it seems to us

that in light of the paucity of existing research on the topic of the relations between Indians and other ethnic groups, there are various studies, some of an "applied" or action-oriented nature rather than a theoretical nature, which might usefully be pursued in this area. One such action-oriented piece of research would look towards a time, perhaps a decade or more away, when the prevailing ideology of Indian self-help ("go-it-alone") and self-reliance may be softened to admit of a greater degree of Indian/non-Indian co-operation and coalition formation. Thus, research such as that which we have reported in this paper but with an even larger sample, could be done to help Indians identify potential coalition partners and to assess the potential for other types of co-operative efforts with ethnic organizations and associations. Given the absence of religious variables in our own study, a study which focuses upon the variations in attitudes towards Indians on the part of the major religious and denominational sectors of Canadian society might some day prove to be a useful resource for Indian politicians. For instance, although the Roman Catholic church and various Protestant denominations have demonstrated a new co-operativeness through their actions (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980:283-91), little is known about the orientations of Jews and Hutterites towards Indians.

Survey methodology, however, should by no means be the only vehicle for examining the effects of ethnic characteristics upon orientations towards Indians. More community-level participant observation studies like Stymeist's are needed, particularly to explore the experiential basis behind variations in those orientations and to identify precisely what it is which sets Indians apart from other ethnic groups in the minds of those ethnic group members.

We have found the non-Indian population to be very heterogeneous in its orientations towards Indians, and future research would be well advised to take this heterogeneity into account, especially in its sampling design. This heterogeneity of the non-Indian population brings to mind the heterogeneity of the Native population in Canada and the opposition of many Natives to recent government actions and policies which "lump" the various separate aboriginal peoples (status Indians, non-status Indians, Metis, and Inuit) into the one broad category "Native" and then prescribe uniform treatment for all those thus subsumed. Related to this, it would be useful if future research could ascertain the extent to

which the non-Indian public differentiates between the different sub-categories of the "Native" population. Are certain religious or ethnic groups more attuned than others to the concerns and anxieties which status Indians, for instance, have about such over-arching "Native" policies?

Our research, that of Stymeist, and that of Berry et al. all point towards the existence of racist beliefs about Indians on the part of certain sectors of the population. Rather than perceiving Indians as one among many ethnic groups, many respondents in these studies (e.g., respondents with ethnic origins in certain east European countries) tend to perceive Indians as a racial group set apart. Further research is needed to provide a more thorough understanding of the specific content of those racist beliefs about Indians. Further to our earlier ideological explanation of the unfavourable orientations which many of our Polish Canadian respondents held towards Indians, it would also be useful to conduct research aimed at identifying ways in which Indians are perceived to violate specific values and ideals of any given ethnic group. Such information could be incorporated into school curricula on intergroup relations and value conflicts.

A tangential, but important, point can be noted here with respect to racialism and broader political ideologies. That is, despite the reluctance which arises from the small-L liberal ideology's emphasis upon equal rights and opportunities for all, the federal government, as we noted above, appears to have embarked upon an undeclared policy of treating people of Native Indian ancestry as a distinct category for purposes of certain federal programmes. Thus, on the basis of this racial criterion, "Native people" will be treated differentially from non-Natives. While this is applauded in some quarters as long overdue "affirmative action", it is experiencing a mixed reception among registered Indians. Some Indians are concerned that the already inadequate resources available to them will be diluted by being applied to the larger "Native" population. Other Indians, who remember the government's White Paper proposals of 1969 and who prefer to differentiate Indians from the larger population on the basis of political criteria, are concerned that after a few years of such a "Native" policy the federal government will move to eliminate the special rights and privileges of status Indians and other Natives in the name of eliminating racialism.

Thus the very abhorrence which the dominant North American ideology of small-liberalism holds for racialism may ironically eventually operate to the detriment of at least registered Indians. One implication of all this for future research is that research is needed on the ideological underpinnings of federal (and provincial) government policies and programmes for Indians and other Natives (Weaver in Ponting, 1980).

Finally, in a fashion somewhat similar to Breton (in Ponting, 1980) we wish to suggest that it is well worthwhile to carry out research which would measure changes over time in the orientations which we have identified. For instance, as Indians are granted constitutional concessions that are withheld from other ethnic groups, and as the immigrant stream to Canada comes to contain more non-whites who may be involved in increased competition with a growing Indian labour force for unskilled and semi-skilled jobs, what changes will occur among Blacks and other ethnic groups in their orientations towards Indians?

In concluding, we offer a few brief thoughts on the federal government's multiculturalism policy. That such unfavourable orientations towards Indians exist in some ethnic groups could indicate that mechanisms for inter-ethnic communication are not in place or are not working effectively. Rather than Canada being a land of "two solitudes", it appears that we may be a land of many solitudes, a land where various ethnic groups do not share in each other's culture even at the most basic level of knowing about it, let alone selectively adopting one or another aspect of it. Annual multi-ethnic cultural pageants of but a few days duration are not effective sharing mechanisms, we contend. Rather, they may actually serve to reinforce differences while making a spectacle out of the groups participating. They are not good vehicles for portraying the humanistic and philosophical aspects of an ethnic culture. What is particularly needed is a redoubling of current efforts at inter-cultural appreciation in the schools. In the case of conveying Indian cultures, such courses may first have to deal in a corrective fashion with "knowledge" about Indians which non-Indians have acquired on the streets and playgrounds of the community. Only after such prejudices have been addressed can there even be any realistic expectation that non-Indians would be receptive to the notion that Indians might well have something to teach them. Lest the reader be left

with the mistaken impression that we regard education as a panacea, we return in closing to the matter raised at the outset of this paper, namely, the respective contributions of structural and social psychological factors in shaping intergroup relations. In that regard, surely one of the main catalysts for changed non-Indian attitudes and for greater non-Indian receptivity to the potential contributions which Indians can make to a renewed Canada, would be the observation by non-Indians of economic development and improved living conditions among Indians.

NOTES

1. The authors gratefully acknowledge the funding provided by the Donner Canadian Foundation and The University of Calgary, without which this research would not have been possible.
2. For instance, the Multicultural Council of Toronto has lobbied the Prime Minister with the request that any discussion on a new Canadian constitution include representation of ethnic minorities. See "Include Us In Constitutional Debate, Trudeau Told", *Cultures Canada* (Newsletter of the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism) I, 7 (1980):1.
3. The authors are grateful to Dr. J.L.A. Horna of the University of Calgary for suggesting the explanation to follow and for her very kind efforts in compiling the documentation to substantiate it. The subsequent comment about the heterogeneity of Eastern Europeans, particularly the Czechs and Slovaks, is also hers.
4. Slightly over ten percent of the sample (191 respondents) fell in none of the above categories and has been excluded from the analysis below. For example, there were 72 respondents who were Canadian born, who had Canadian-born fathers, but whose mothers were foreign-born.
5. The procedure we followed involved first testing for statistically significant differences across all three categories of the independent variable. Then we repeated the tests taking the three generational subsamples one pair at a time (i.e., comparing the first and second generations on one dependent variable, then the second and third generations on that same dependent variable, and finally, the first and third generations on that same dependent variable). "T-tests" were used here.
6. The number of first and second generation Francophone immigrant respondents (two of each) was far too small to influence the findings as they pertained to the first and second generation subsamples.

7. As an anonymous referee of this article noted, the relationship between bilingualism and tolerance/understanding may in fact be one of reciprocal causality. That is, in addition to the causal relationship mentioned in the text, it is possible that more tolerant or understanding people may learn a second language more readily than the less tolerant or less understanding.
8. By way of background we note that over thirty percent of our respondents were bilingual in some form; almost 15 % were bilingual in English and French, and almost 15% were bilingual in English and some language other than French. Only a further 2%, whom we have dropped from consideration for statistical reasons, could carry on a conversation in English, French, and at least one other language. Data not shown here revealed that in our sample, as in the Canadian population as a whole, persons who are bilingual in English and French are more apt to be native Francophones than Anglophones.

REFERENCES

- Berry, John W., Rudolf Kalin, and Donald M. Taylor
 1976 *Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada*. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.
- Henry, Frances
 1977 *The Dynamics of Racism in Toronto*. Downsview, Ont.: York University.
- Innis, Hugh R.
 1973 *Bilingualism and Biculturalism*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Linklater, Clive
 1980 *Open Letter (re: National Indian Brotherhood Presidential Election)*. Ottawa, 16 pp. (mimeo).
- Matejko, Joanna and Alexander Matejko
 1974 "Polish Canadians" pp. 37-60 in Benedykt Heydenkorn (ed.) *Past and Present: Selected Topics on the Polish Group in Canada*. Toronto: Polish Alliance Press.
- Ponting, J. Rick and Roger Gibbins
 1981 "English Canadians' and French Quebecers' Reactions to Contemporary Indian Protest," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* XVIII, 2.
- Ponting, J. Rick and Roger Gibbins
 1980 *Out of Irrelevance: A Socio-Political Introduction to Indian Affairs in Canada*. Scarborough, Ont.: Butterworths.

Stymeist, David H.

1975 *Ethnic and Indians: Social Relations in a Northwestern Ontario Town*. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates.