

# Perceptions of People in Canada: Canadian-Born vs. Internationally-Born Postsecondary Students' Perspectives

Shira Packer and Dana Lynch

---

*Explicit sociolinguistic instruction in language classrooms has become more widely accepted than ever, but the understanding and teaching of Canadian culture remains a controversial issue, particularly as Canadian culture becomes increasingly diverse. The degree to which Canadians are perceived to exhibit characteristics such as "politeness" and "friendliness" has stirred debate, particularly in ESL (English as a second language) and EAP (English for academic purposes) classrooms, owing to differing personal experiences and acculturation processes. This Canada-wide, mixed-methods study compared Canadian-born (CB) and internationally-born (IB) postsecondary students' and recent graduates' perceptions of people in Canada. Employing social media outreach, the study consisted of an online survey and follow-up e-interviews. Emphasis is given to quantitative rather than qualitative data analysis. Findings suggest that the overall perceptions of CB and IB groups are more similar than different. However, when unprompted, CB respondents are more likely than IB respondents to perceive people in Canada as "polite," "kind," and "caring." In addition, Likert-scale results demonstrate that CB respondents are significantly more likely to perceive people in Canada as "funny," "intelligent," "caring," and "hardworking." Implications are drawn for the degree to which IBs are acculturating to Canadian society and the extent to which a positive acculturation process can be explicitly addressed in ESL/EAP programs.*

*Si l'enseignement explicite de la sociolinguistique dans les cours de langue est plus accepté que jamais, les conceptions et l'enseignement de la culture canadienne demeurent un sujet controversé, surtout que la culture se diversifie davantage. La mesure dans laquelle l'on perçoit que les Canadiens sont « polis » et « aimables » a suscité des débats, notamment dans les cours d'ALS et d'anglais académique où les expériences personnelles et l'acculturation varient d'une personne à l'autre. Cette étude à méthodologie mixte s'est déroulée à l'échelle du Canada et a comparé les perceptions de gens au Canada qu'ont des étudiants nés au Canada et nés à l'étranger, au postsecondaire ou récemment diplômés. Profitant des médias sociaux, cette recherche a comporté une enquête et des entrevues de suivi en ligne. Nous avons misé sur une analyse quantitative plutôt que qualitative des données. Les résultats suggèrent que les perceptions globales des deux groupes se ressemblent plus qu'elles ne se distinguent. Toutefois, les étudiants nés au Canada ont proposé spontanément que les Canadiens étaient « polis », « gentils » et « bienveillants » plus souvent que les étudiants nés à l'étranger. De plus, selon*

*une échelle de Likert, les étudiants nés au Canada sont significativement plus portés à percevoir les gens au Canada comme étant « drôles », « intelligents », « attentionnés » et « travaillants ». Nous présentons les incidences liées à la mesure dans laquelle les étudiants nés à l'étranger s'intègrent à la société canadienne et les conséquences de la possibilité d'évoquer de façon explicite un processus d'acculturation positive dans les programmes d'ALS et d'anglais académique.*

---

After the publication of several decades of research contributing to socio-cultural theory, it is now widely recognized that language is fundamentally created and constrained by the culture in which it is spoken (Bachman, 1990; Brown, 1994; Kramsch, 1998; Lantolf & Poehner, 2008; Swain, Kinnear, & Steinman, 2011; Vygotsky, 1962). Since Hymes introduced the concept of communicative competence (1972) and even since Canale and Swain identified sociolinguistic competency as one of the three main linguistic competencies (1980), language has been understood not as an isolated system but as part of daily social communication. For instance, Norton Peirce (1995) furthers this understanding in her consideration of social identity, or the integration of the language learner and the context of language learning, which is facilitated by acceptance in the target language culture. It is within these frameworks, and others, that culture has become understood as an inherent and inseparable aspect of language. It is similarly understood that when teaching any given language, we are inherently and inseparably teaching a given culture in an effort to facilitate second language learners' acculturation processes (Kasper & Rose, 2002; Lantolf & Poehner, 2008; Norton, 2000).

With this in mind, Canadian English language teachers may attempt to understand "Canadian culture," an often ambiguous topic, so as to explore it, and thus teach it, more effectively. The concept of "culture" is better understood through the following definition:

[the] practices, beliefs, values, symbols and traditions, with particular ways of understanding the world. Cultures can be understood as the fixed, inherited features of different national, ethnic and religious groups . . . . Cultures can also be understood as dynamic and changing, continually being redefined by individuals and groups as they interact with others of different backgrounds or respond to changing circumstances. (Byram, Barrett, Ipgrave, Jackson, & Méndez García, 2009, p. 9)

Thus Canadian culture is constantly being redefined with every wave of immigration, each of which creates enhanced opportunities for intercultural encounters. As a method to explore this topic in the classroom, instructors may elicit students' perceptions about Canadian culture, including Canadian national identity and Canadian personality traits. They may try to synthesize international students' etic (or outsider perspective) notions of Canadian culture with commonly held Canadian emic (or insider perspective) self-

conceptions. To elaborate, the etic perspective “describe[s] differences across cultures in terms of a general, external standard . . . in constructs that apply equally well to other cultures” (Morris, Leung, Ames, & Lickel, 1999, pp. 782–783). In contrast, the emic perspective “describe[s] a particular culture in its own terms . . . in constructs from the [insiders’] self-understanding” (Morris et al., 1999, p. 782). Such self-understandings develop, explicitly and implicitly, from birth as part of the socialization process. In a country as diverse as Canada, both emic and etic perspectives of Canadian culture function in part to create and recreate national identity. To explore these perceptions in the language classroom, teachers commonly ask “What do you think of Canadians?,” “When you think of Canadians what words come to mind?,” “What did you think of Canadian culture before coming to Canada?,” and “Has that changed since you arrived here?” In the authors’ experience conducting such informal discussions, we noted that not all international students seem to agree on what constitutes the typical Canadian, and students’ cultural perceptions often appeared to diverge from some popularized Canadian characteristics: that Canadians are friendly, peaceful, and/or polite. In one specific discussion, whereas many students agreed that Canadians are “friendly” for reasons including holding doors open for others to pass, other students did not agree for reasons including it being rare for Canadians to invite them to their homes. These discussions piqued our interest about whether there is a current framework that accurately describes Canadian culture and identity, and if international students would similarly perceive this description, indicating a positive acculturation process.

We discovered that whereas a number of previous studies have explored the teaching and learning of target language culture, the acculturation process in Canada (see “Conceptual Framework/Literature Review” section below), although recognized as a significant component of language teaching, has yet to become adequately understood by second language teaching literature. We also found that although a number of previous studies have explored national cultural identity, often from the perspective of social psychology (Hofstede, 1980; Katz & Braly, 1933; McCrae & Costa, 1987), existing studies have failed to contrast emic and etic perspectives of Canadian culture. Such a study could contribute to how Canadian culture could be taught in the second language classroom. Consequently, the present study addresses this gap in the current literature by exploring the differences between etic and emic perspectives on an aspect of Canadian culture.

## **Conceptual Framework/Literature Review**

In this section, we provide an overview of three bodies of literature that have influenced this study: (a) acculturation in relation to second language acquisition, (b) personality structure across cultures as a facet of cross-cultural psychology, and (c) Canadian national identity as portrayed by the media.

The term *acculturation* dates back to Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits (1936), where it was defined as “those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups” (p. 149). In any given situation where two individuals of various cultures come into contact, we can expect acculturation to occur. According to Berry and Sam (1980), of the four posited acculturation strategies—*separation*, *integration*, *marginalization*, and *assimilation*—only integration involves both cultural participation in the target cultural group and cultural maintenance of the acculturating individual’s home culture. However, acculturation as a model for second language acquisition was not discussed until Schumann (1978) argued that there is a direct relationship between a learner’s potential to learn a second language and the degree of acculturation to the target language group. More specifically, the degree to which a second language learner can acquire the target language is directly related to the promotion or inhibition of social solidarity between the learner and members of the target language community (Schumann, 1978). Social solidarity is promoted by minimizing the social distance between the second language group and the target language group, facilitating acculturation and language acquisition. Schumann’s model of acculturation has also been applied to academic contexts in studies that explore the relationship between scholastic achievement and cultural adaptation (Berry, 1997; Cheng & Fox, 2008). Cheng and Fox (2008) suggest that Canadian second language postsecondary students who perceive their academic achievement as successful are more likely to have developed stronger strategic learning and social skills during their acculturation process. This suggestion validates the significance of attempting to shed light on the acculturation process in Canada by exploring the differences in cultural personality perceptions between internationally-born and Canadian-born groups.

To further explore these differences, this study surveys *person perception* or “the process of forming impressions of others” (Matsumoto & Juang, 2008, p. 358). For many years, person perception has been used by social psychologists to explore cultural stereotypes, or “generalized images that we have about groups of people, particularly about their underlying psychological characteristics or personality traits” (Lee, Jussim, & McCauley, 1995, as cited in Matsumoto & Juang, 2008, p. 381). Matsumoto and Juang (2008, p. 381) indicate that stereotypes can be classified as autostereotypes when they are about one’s own cultural group and heterostereotypes when they are about other cultural groups. As the first study to scientifically explore heterostereotypes, Katz and Braly (1933) had undergraduate Princeton students select five personality traits, from a list of 84, that they thought were representative of 10 different ethnic and national groups. Data were correlated to better understand the perceptions that were widely held about each ethnic and national group, thus exploring corresponding stereotypes.

Many other cross-cultural psychology studies clustered individual, national, and cultural attributes into categories (Hofstede, 1980; McCrae & Costa, 1987; Paunonen, Jackson, Trzebinski, & Forsterling, 1992; Tupes & Christal, 1961; Williams, Satterwhite, & Saiz, 1998). Hofstede (1980) explored etic notions of culture by conducting cross-national surveys of IBM employees to uncover variations in cultural values and attitudes. His cultural dimensions theory postulates that the values of cultural groups can be measured according to five dimensions: power (equality versus inequality), collectivism (versus individualism), uncertainty avoidance (versus tolerance), masculinity (versus femininity), and temporal orientation. According to his findings, relative to other countries, Canada scores high in individualism, defined as “the degree of interdependence a society maintains among its members” (Hofstede, n.d., para. 4). This, he explains, reflects the expectation for Canadians to care first for themselves and their immediate families in contrast to collectivist societies, which tend to identify more with groups. Canada also scores relatively low in long-term orientation, defined as “the extent to which a society shows a pragmatic future-oriented perspective rather than a conventional historical short-term point of view” (Hofstede, n.d., para. 10). He suggests that Canadians are likely to seek short-term results with regard to performance in the workplace.

Arguably more than academic publications, nonacademic publications, due to their wider reach, have contributed to a Canadian national identity. On innumerable occasions, mainstream media have described Canadians as polite. They even described Canadians as “polite to a fault” when a house, after having been firebombed, received a letter of apology in the mail (Greirson, 2008). When a man waited in line to rob a Tim Hortons, bloggers were quick to label him as “polite” rather than “stupid” (City Data Forum, 2011). The *Toronto Star* criticized the 2011 Occupy Toronto movement as being overly polite and respectful (Walkom, 2011). As the joke goes, “What’s the best way to get a Canadian to apologize? Step on his foot.” Politeness aside, according to data from the 2005 census, Statistics Canada (2008) suggests that almost one third of Canadians have identified themselves as workaholics. In addition, Richard Gwyn (2007), author of a biography of Canada’s first prime minister, John A. Macdonald, has suggested that “*tolerance* has replaced *loyalty* as the touchstone of Canadian identity” (p. 367). Cohen (2007), author of *The Unfinished Canadian*, also values how non-Canadians perceive Canadians:

Looking at Canadians through the eyes of foreigners, we get a sense of how they see us. They say so much about us: that we are nice, hospitable, modest, blind to our achievements. That we are obedient, conservative, deferential, colonial and complex, particularly so. That we are fractious, envious, geographically impossible and politically improbable. (p. 48)

As a development from the aforementioned studies in Canadian national identity, cross-cultural social psychology, and acculturation in the second language classroom, this study explores personality perceptions of people in Canada from both emic and etic perspectives. Acknowledging that there are many more people who identify as Canadian than those born in Canada and acknowledging that many people who were born internationally identify as Canadian, for the purposes of our study our respondent groups were chosen as follows. Our original intention for this study was to compare and contrast “Canadian” and “international student” perceptions on a specific aspect of Canadian culture, that is, characteristics of Canadians. However, we did not wish to involve immigration status as a defining feature because immigration status does not necessarily reflect socialization in Canadian society. Therefore, the selection criteria for the Canadian-born group of participants—that the participant (a) was born in Canada and (b) has not spent more than 10 years living outside the country—are meant to gather at minimum second-generation Canadians so as to increase the likelihood of significant Canadian socialization, yielding an emic perspective on Canadian culture. Additionally, the internationally-born group of participants are defined as those not born in Canada but who have been in Canada for less than 10 years so as to limit socialization in Canadian society, contributing to an etic perspective of Canadian culture. Similarly, to exclude the immigration status of the subjects of the study, we asked respondents to evaluate “people in Canada,” not “Canadians.” We should clarify that we do not wish to claim that certain groups are “more Canadian” than others; rather we wish to contrast emic and etic perceptions of certain aspects of Canadian culture. Thus the research question addressed in this study is the following:

At Canadian postsecondary institutions, how do (a) Canadian-born students and recent graduates’ (CBs) and (b) internationally-born students and recent graduates’ (IBs) perceptions of people in Canada differ (if at all)?

For the purposes of this study, *recent graduates* are those who have graduated from postsecondary studies within the past 5 years. Similarly, the term *people in Canada* includes all people who are physically present in Canada regardless of immigration status, race, profession, or education level, and therefore contribute to Canadian culture in a dynamic fashion.

## Methodology

The survey was piloted in December 2010 ( $n = 20$ ) and launched in January 2011. Data for the study were collected between January and April 2011. Using e-mail and social media to broaden our reach, we conducted an extensive, national online survey of CBs’ and IBs’ perceptions of people in Canada. This mixed-methods study consists of two sections: (a) an online survey (see

Appendix A;  $n = 299$ ), and (b) follow-up e-interviews (see Appendix B;  $n = 16$ ), allowing us to get more detailed data.

### *Online Survey*

The online survey was administered using SurveyMonkey<sup>1</sup> and consisted of three parts: respondent background questions, an unprompted adjective ranking question, and Likert-scale questions.

*Respondent background questions.* Personal background questions differed slightly according to whether respondents indicated they were CBs or IBs. Questions asked to both groups of respondents included length of time in Canada, college/university status, age, sex, academic discipline, highest level of education completed, first language, additional languages known, country of current residence, where they live(d) in Canada, and country of birth. CBs were asked additional questions, for example, length of time spent outside Canada (if at all). IBs were also asked additional questions such as length of time in Canada, expected total length of time in Canada (if they were currently living in Canada), English-language education course(s) in their country of birth, and degree of contact with native-born Canadians in their daily life in Canada.

*Unprompted adjective ranking section.* This question asked CBs/IBs to provide five personality traits that come to mind when thinking about people in Canada. This was an unprompted, spontaneous, “top of mind” adjective ranking. Respondents were asked, “Think about all the people you’ve met in Canada. What are 5 personality traits (characteristics or adjectives) that you think of to describe them?” We specified that “[p]ersonality traits are those that describe the way that people act, not look.” They were subsequently provided five fields in which they could input their ranked adjectives.

*Likert-scale section.* This section asked, “To what extent do you agree with the following statements, where 1 represents *strongly disagree* and 5 represents *strongly agree*?” We then listed 30 statements in randomized order, in the form “People in Canada are \_\_\_\_\_.” Each statement contained a different adjective or trait (see Appendix A). In the event that respondents did not understand a given adjective, they could opt out of a question by selecting “neither agree nor disagree.”

The responses to these 30 statements represent a snapshot of how the CB/IB respondent perceives the “average” person in Canada. The 30 adjectives or traits contained in each statement were chosen by considering (a) adjectives that have come up during classroom discussions about Canadians, (b) adjectives used to describe aspects of culture according to intercultural communication theorists such as Hofstede (1980),<sup>2</sup> (c) adjectives that bear a relatively specific meaning,<sup>3</sup> and (d) adjectives traditionally or frequently used to describe Canadians in print sources (see “Conceptual Framework/Literature Review” section). For instance, Cohen’s (2007) discussion of how non-Canadians have historically perceived Canadians was particularly use-

ful in refining our selection of adjectives. We used several personality adjectives in our survey that Cohen suggests non-Canadians have used to describe Canadians: “polite,” “generous,” “boring,” “individualistic,” “peaceful,” “hardworking,” “open-minded,” and “caring.” An unpaired *t*-test was used to determine significant differences between CB and IB respondent groups at a 95% confidence interval.

### *E-interview*

At the end of the survey, both CB and IB respondents were invited to participate in the second phase of the research via a qualitative e-mail interview. The questions asked the respondents to define their own identities and to elaborate on both positive and negative experiences that they had with people in Canada.

### *Survey Outreach*

To maximize the number of respondents, multiple avenues of outreach were used: personal and professional contacts via e-mail, Facebook, Vimeo, and Twitter. Our use of Facebook for survey outreach had several aspects: sending the survey link to personal contacts, posting the survey invitation to hundreds of official postsecondary Facebook pages and student organization pages, and creating our own Facebook page, “Perceptions of People in Canada Survey.” In each of these channels, we posted a link to a brief, humorous video to attract the attention of potential respondents.<sup>4</sup>

## **Results**

### *Respondents’ Background Information*

Ultimately, 299 respondents completed the survey: 130 CBs and 169 IBs (43.48% and 56.52% of respondents, respectively). Respondents came from 83 institutions (see Appendix C), representing every province and territory across Canada except Nunavut. The two sample groups, while not perfectly homogeneous, share similar distributions, such as gender and age (see Table 1).

In addition, because 79% of the CBs had spent less than one year living outside of Canada, we can conclude that most CBs have spent sufficient time in Canada to develop an emic vantage point. (Recall that Canadian-born participants who had lived for 10 years or more outside Canada were unable to participate in the study.) Approximately 66% of IB respondents had spent more than one year in Canada, and 75% expect to spend more than 2 years here. Moreover, IB respondents reported having considerable contact with native-born Canadians. Approximately two thirds (66.9%) reported having “a lot” or “quite a lot” of contact with native-born Canadians; 23.1% reported “a little” and 10% reported “very little” contact.



Table 1  
Gender, Age, and Linguistic Background

	CBs %	IBs %
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	29.23	41.42
Female	70.77	58.58
<i>Age</i>		
Under 18	60.77	63.31
18-24	31.54	30.77
25-34	3.85	4.734
35-44	1.54	0.59
45+	2.32	0.59
<i>First language</i>		
English	96.9	35.50
French	3.07	4.73
Hindi/Urdu	-	10.08
Cantonese	-	8.28
Spanish	-	7.1
Mandarin	-	5.92
German	-	5.32
Other <sup>a</sup>	0.03	23.07

<sup>a</sup>includes Arabic, Bengali, Catalan, Croatian, Farsi, Gujarati, Hebrew, Italian, Korean, Macedonian, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Swahili, Tagalog, Tamil, Turkish, Vietnamese.

### *CBs' vs. IBs' Perceptions*

Although analysis of the data resulted in the identification of many overall similar perceptions between CBs and IBs of people in Canada, we found some significant differences. Evidence of such is reported in three categories, according to the three sections of this study: unprompted adjective ranking section (using quantitative analysis), Likert-scale section (using quantitative analysis), and e-interview section (using qualitative analysis).

#### *Unprompted adjective ranking section*

For the unprompted adjective ranking section, in which respondents were asked to provide five personality characteristics to describe people in Canada, we used a weighted ranking method of analysis. Using this method, each adjective was given a score based on how the respondent ranked the item within the five available positions. We assigned 5 points to an item that the respondent provided in first place, 4 points for second place, 3 points for third, 2 points for fourth, and 1 point for fifth. As illustrated in Table 2, the results indicate that "friendly" is the item with the highest score for both CBs (218 points) and IBs (310 points).

Table 2  
Top 30 Responses Using Weighted Ranking Method of Analysis

Adjective	All respon- dents ( <i>n</i> = 299)	CBs ( <i>n</i> = 130)		IBs ( <i>n</i> = 169)		Abso- lute differ- ence <sup>a</sup>
	Weighted ranking score	Weighted ranking score	Weighted ranking score per respon- dent	Weighted ranking score	Weighted ranking score per respon- dent	
Friendly	528	218	1.68	310	1.83	0.16
Polite	382	204	1.57	178	1.05	<b>0.52</b>
Helpful, helping	234	94	0.72	140	0.83	0.11
Kind, kindly	159	98	0.75	61	0.36	<b>0.39</b>
Nice	107	39	0.30	68	0.40	0.10
Open-minded	106	44	0.34	62	0.37	0.03
Respectful, respecting	63	20	0.15	43	0.25	0.10
Caring	59	44	0.34	15	0.09	<b>0.25</b>
Funny, humorous	75	42	0.32	33	0.20	0.13
Reserved	57	15	0.12	42	0.25	0.13
Outgoing	54	14	0.11	40	0.24	0.13
Cold	44	9	0.07	35	0.21	0.14
Generous	43	30	0.23	13	0.08	0.15
Tolerant	41	28	0.22	13	0.08	0.14
Open	40	12	0.09	28	0.17	0.07
Considerate	35	19	0.15	16	0.09	0.05
Easygoing	33	5	0.04	28	0.17	0.13
Accepting	32	23	0.18	9	0.05	0.12
Hardworking	32	14	0.11	18	0.11	0.00
Quiet	32	22	0.17	10	0.06	0.11
Conservative	31	13	0.10	18	0.11	0.01
Selfish	31	6	0.05	25	0.15	0.10
Intelligent	30	20	0.15	10	0.06	0.09
Welcoming	28	18	0.14	10	0.06	0.08
Courteous	27	15	0.12	12	0.07	0.04
Honest	26	17	0.13	9	0.05	0.08
Talkative	25	3	0.02	22	0.13	0.11
Relaxing, relaxed	25	8	0.06	17	0.10	0.04
Diverse	24	9	0.07	15	0.09	0.02

<sup>a</sup>Absolute difference between CB and IB weighted ranking score per respondent. All absolute differences greater than 0.20 are bolded

Due to the different samples sizes of each group, we divided the weighted ranking score by the sample size of each group to determine the score per respondent, which can be analyzed to make a just comparison between the scores of the two respondent groups. Using this method, we can report that CBs are significantly more likely to perceive people in Canada as “polite” (204 points; 1.57 points per respondent) than are IBs (178 points; 1.05 points per respondent). Similarly, this method suggests that CBs are much more likely to perceive people in Canada as “kind/kindly” (98 points; 0.75 points per respondent) than are IBs (61 points; 0.36 per respondent) and “caring” (0.34 points per respondent) as compared to IBs (0.09 points per respondent).

#### *Likert-scale section*

For this section, respondents were asked to determine on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*), the extent to which they agreed that people in Canada exhibited each of the 30 adjectives. We calculated the mean (*M*) response for each adjective to determine the strength to which respondents agreed. “Polite” (*M* = 4.11), “friendly” (*M* = 4.08), “peaceful” (*M* = 4.05), “helpful” (*M* = 3.98), “respectful” (*M* = 3.88), and “open-minded” (*M* = 3.88) were rated most positively by the total respondent population (see Table 3). However, in the unprompted adjective ranking section, “friendly” experienced a higher weighted ranking score per respondent than did “polite.” Another point of departure between this section and the unprompted adjective ranking section is that the adjective with the third highest mean here is “peaceful” (*M* = 4.05), which in the unprompted adjective ranking section only occurred three times and received only 6 points using the weighted ranking method. Similarly, in the Likert-scale section of the survey, results indicate equal means for “respectful” and “open-minded” (*M* = 3.88 each), while in the unprompted adjective ranking section “open-minded” received considerably more weight (*n* = 106) than “respectful” (*n* = 63). Therefore, “peaceful” and “respectful” received higher levels of agreement when prompted than when unprompted.

The adjectives that received the lowest means (i.e., that showed the least agreement from the respondents that people in Canada exhibited these characteristics) are “cold” (*M* = 2.77), “afraid” (*M* = 2.77), “dissatisfied” (*M* = 2.89), “boring” (*M* = 2.9), and “risk-taking” (*M* = 2.96). For all the adjectives presented, respondents were least in agreement that people in Canada were “cold.” “Cold” was also the adjective that generated the most controversy, with a standard deviation of 1.119 for CBs and 1.197 for IBs, the highest standard deviations among all the adjectives presented. (To recall, “cold” was also a somewhat frequently mentioned adjective (*n* = 11; 44 points) in the unprompted adjective ranking section.)

Using an unpaired *t*-test, we were able to calculate the *p*-value (*p*) at a 95% confidence interval to determine how statistically significant the difference is between the CB mean and IB mean for each of the 30 adjectives.<sup>5</sup> Identical re-

Table 3  
Likert-Scale Section Mean Analysis Listed According to Total Sample Mean

Adjective	Total sample mean ( <i>n</i> = 299)	CB mean ( <i>n</i> = 130)	IB mean ( <i>n</i> = 169)	CB <i>SD</i>	IB <i>SD</i>
People in Canada are POLITE	4.11	4.18	4.06	.943	1.016
People in Canada are FRIENDLY	4.08	4.22	3.97	.939	1.065
People in Canada are PEACEFUL	4.05	4.08	4.03	.950	.936
People in Canada are HELPFUL	3.98	4.02	3.95	.932	1.022
People in Canada are RESPECTFUL	3.88	3.92	3.85	.982	1.074
People in Canada are OPEN-MINDED	3.88	3.85	3.91	1.011	1.081
People in Canada are COOPERATIVE	3.81	3.87	3.76	.781	.859
People in Canada are EASYGOING	3.81	3.93	3.72	.917	.970
People in Canada are INDIVIDUALISTIC	3.73	3.66	3.78	1.00	1.083
People in Canada are HARDWORKING	3.72	3.94	3.56	.833	1.071
People in Canada are OUTGOING	3.69	3.65	3.72	.887	1.063
People in Canada are INTELLIGENT	3.68	3.92	3.50	.813	.920
People in Canada are CARING	3.66	3.89	3.48	.989	1.025
People in Canada are FUNNY	3.65	3.93	3.44	.837	1.009
People in Canada are OPTIMISTIC	3.65	3.68	3.63	.907	.909
People in Canada are MATERIALISTIC	3.64	3.62	3.65	1.021	1.100
People in Canada are HONEST	3.59	3.65	3.54	.895	1.015
People in Canada are SELF-CONFIDENT	3.59	3.45	3.69	.863	.930
People in Canada are RELIABLE	3.59	3.76	3.46	.824	.939
People in Canada are GENEROUS	3.55	3.68	3.44	.925	.969
People in Canada are COMPETITIVE	3.49	3.61	3.40	.965	1.119
People in Canada are MODEST	3.49	3.62	3.40	.983	.993
People in Canada are LOYAL	3.48	3.67	3.34	.907	1.030
People in Canada are PATIENT	3.47	3.58	3.40	.905	1.042
People in Canada are SELFISH	3.00	2.88	3.09	1.023	1.129
People in Canada are RISK-TAKING	2.96	2.95	2.96	.897	1.002
People in Canada are BORING	2.90	2.77	3.01	1.089	1.123
People in Canada are DISSATISFIED	2.89	2.89	2.88	1.051	.941
People in Canada are COLD	2.77	2.58	2.92	1.119	1.197
People in Canada are AFRAID	2.77	2.69	2.82	1.070	.966

sults of significance were achieved when data analysis was replicated via the Mann-Whitney U test, concluding that results are not sensitive to non-normality. To first determine if there was overall significance between the two groups, we separated the positive adjectives from the negative adjectives, omitting “competitive,” which we consider a relatively neutral term. With regard to the positive adjectives, the CB mean ( $M = 3.79$ ) was higher than the IB mean ( $M = 3.63$ ); however, this difference is statistically insignificant ( $p = 0.141$ ) and thus inconclusive. Similarly, although CBs were less likely to agree that people in Canada personify the negative adjectives ( $M = 3.01$ ) than were the IBs ( $M = 3.16$ ), there is no statistical significance ( $p = 0.224$ ). We therefore wish to highlight that there is no overall statistically significant difference in the perceptions between CBs and IBs for this section of the survey.

However, as illustrated in Table 4, our results indicate that there is statistical significance in the difference between the two respondent groups for 10 specific adjectives, most prominently for “intelligent” ( $p = 0.000$ ), “funny” ( $p = 0.000$ ), “caring” ( $p = 0.001$ ), and “hardworking” ( $p = 0.001$ ). In each of these cases, CBs are much more likely than IBs to agree that people in Canada exhibit the corresponding adjective. Similarly, CBs are more likely than IBs to agree that people in Canada are “loyal” ( $p = 0.004$ ), “reliable” ( $p = 0.004$ ), “self-confident” ( $p = 0.019$ ), “friendly” ( $p = 0.034$ ), and “generous” ( $p = 0.036$ ). On the contrary, IBs are more likely than CBs to agree that people in Canada are “cold” ( $p = 0.015$ ).

#### *E-interview section*

The e-interview section was designed to capture a qualitative account of CBs’ and IBs’ positive and negative experiences with people in Canada, blending aspects from phenomenological and ethnographic approaches to qualitative research design (Creswell, 1998). The e-interview questions do not explicitly use any of the adjectives in the survey section, and in this sense are an extension of the unprompted adjective ranking section. The data analysis presented in this section offers data triangulation, strengthening and functioning as an extension of some of the results from the survey section. The quotations presented in this section have been selected for this report for reasons including level of (a) description; (b) disclosure; (c) dependability, or indications from multiple respondents; and (d) transferability, or consistency with the results reported in previous sections on this study (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994).<sup>6</sup>

Although 135 survey respondents offered to participate in an e-interview, only 16 respondents submitted their responses. When asked to describe a positive experience that the respondent had with a person or a group of people in Canada, one CB described an experience in a public venue that involves politeness, one of the most frequently occurring adjectives in the unprompted adjective ranking section:

I was walking through my grocery store one day with my mom and we saw a man accidentally bump into a girl . . . The girl explained

about the man saying sorry, and the friend just said, “oh, yeah, we have to say ‘sorry’ here, it’s a Canadian thing.”

This illustrates that this respondent considers “politeness” to be a prominent, positive attribute of people in Canada.

Table 4  
Unpaired *t*-test Results for the Likert-Scale Section  
Listed According to *p*-Value

Adjective	<i>t</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value at 95% confidence interval	CB mean ( <i>n</i> = 130)	IB mean ( <i>n</i> = 169)
People in Canada are FUNNY	4.479	0.000	3.93	3.44
People in Canada are INTELLIGENT	4.173	0.000	3.92	3.50
People in Canada are CARING	3.462	0.001	3.89	3.48
People in Canada are HARDWORKING	3.341	0.001	3.94	3.56
People in Canada are LOYAL	2.927	0.004	3.67	3.34
People in Canada are RELIABLE	2.887	0.004	3.76	3.46
People in Canada are COLD	-2.449	0.015	2.58	2.92
People in Canada are SELF-CONFIDENT	-2.361	0.019	3.45	3.69
People in Canada are FRIENDLY	2.132	0.034	4.22	3.97
People in Canada are GENEROUS	2.103	0.036	3.68	3.44
People in Canada are EASYGOING	1.891	0.060	3.93	3.72
People in Canada are MODEST	1.869	0.063	3.62	3.40
People in Canada are BORING	-1.833	0.068	2.77	3.01
People in Canada are COMPETITIVE	1.739	0.083	3.61	3.40
People in Canada are SELFISH	-1.714	0.088	2.88	3.09
People in Canada are PATIENT	1.571	0.117	3.58	3.40
People in Canada are AFRAID	-1.102	0.271	2.69	2.82
People in Canada are COOPERATIVE	1.086	0.278	3.87	3.76
People in Canada are POLITE	1.091	0.296	4.18	4.06
People in Canada are HONEST	1.002	0.317	3.65	3.54
People in Canada are INDIVIDUALISTIC	-.978	0.329	3.66	3.78
People in Canada are RESPECTFUL	.630	0.529	3.92	3.85
People in Canada are HELPFUL	.610	0.542	4.02	3.95
People in Canada are OUTGOING	-.589	0.556	3.65	3.72
People in Canada are OPTIMISTIC	.522	0.602	3.68	3.63
People in Canada are OPEN-MINDED	-.484	0.629	3.85	3.91
People in Canada are PEACEFUL	.431	0.667	4.08	4.03
People in Canada are MATERIALISTIC	-.240	0.810	3.62	3.65
People in Canada are DISSATISFIED	.086	0.931	2.89	2.88
People in Canada are RISK-TAKING	-.042	0.966	2.95	2.96

An IB provided a positive experience about his academic acculturation process, illustrating the adjective “helpful/helping” (the third-highest-rated adjective in the unprompted adjective ranking and fourth-highest-rated in the Likert-scale section): “When i came to Canada many people in University helped me to adapt to the environment and to reduce the culture shock.” Another IB described people in Canada as “friendly,” “helpful/helping,” and “nice” in more detail:

My very first day at york [university] . . . Just as I came to my residence people were there to help. Everyone was a complete stranger yet so friendly. . . . The people helping me did the heavy lifting of my things, yet they seemed to enjoy it. I was a positive experience cause coming from a different continent a different culture this was not expected. It did represent the typical friendly and nice nature of Canadians.

In some cases, adjectives not presented in the survey section came up in the qualitative section, such as “pleasant.” One CB reports a positive experience with a person or people in Canada:

I walk in, wait in line and see that the tellers are pleasant . . . That person took the time to look into my eyes and make a connection even though she didn't “need” to. She didn't seem to be worried about the long line behind me and whatever else she had to get done that day.

Respondents were also asked to describe a negative experience that they had with a person or group of people in Canada. One CB negatively perceived the high expectations to be “nice” and the dangers of being perceived as “cold” in his/her work environment.

I was at work and someone . . . asked for my assistance on a project . . . I was really confused, but I suppose because I wasn't very perky they interpreted me as being cold. This is typical of some general bad things I've experienced in Canada—being scared to offend someone else to the point of being overly nice and worried, which makes me feel uncomfortable.

The adjective “cold” is also alluded to by another CB reporting on public face: “many Canadians seem to have an impenetrable wall that keeps them from showing others who they really are.” Similarly, IBs frequently commented on struggles to assimilate. One IB reported, “even though Canadians generally seems to be acceptance of others, deep down the heart, they do not really understand others.” Another IB commented on cultural background knowledge that is required to acculturate: “I do not really informed of political, historical, and any general knowledge about Canada and Canadians. It is hard to mingle and mix without knowing of these things especially about

North American entertainment industry and sports.” While these quotes may not explicitly speak to any of the adjectives of focus in the survey, they represent some of the concerns that CBs and IBs have regarding Canadian cultural expectations and values.

## **Potential Limitations**

We recognize there are at least three potential limitations affecting the validity of the results of our survey: (a) relatively concentrated, small sample size; (b) social media bias; and (c) respondents’ linguistic limitations.

### *Relatively Concentrated, Small Sample Size*

Recall that our total sample size was 299, consisting of 130 CB respondents and 169 IB respondents. A larger sample size would increase the statistical significance of our results and allow for cross-tabulation of respondent background information questions and Likert-scale results. In addition, we deem this sample to be a “sample of convenience” and not a perfectly random or representative sample. Although we are pleased to report that respondents representing 84 postsecondary institutions across Canada participated in our survey, the composition of our sample was also somewhat limited and includes significant Toronto urban representation: York University ( $n = 119$ ), University of Toronto ( $n = 36$ ), and Humber Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning ( $n = 10$ ). These institutions are not proportionately representative of postsecondary institutions across Canada.

### *Social Media Bias*

As Facebook and Twitter were used for outreach to respondents, in addition to other methods, respondents with frequent social media access may have been more likely to respond to our survey. Additionally, as we intended our short video promoting the survey to be humorous, this humour had most likely predisposed respondents to suggest more positive adjectives (e.g., helpful, friendly) than negative ones, and may have predisposed respondents to agree with statements containing positive adjectives in the survey. In addition, since the video suggested Canadian stereotypes such as politeness, this may have skewed the results to include more stereotypical adjectives. Similarly, it could have been valuable to question respondents on their opinions of how media have influenced their perceptions of people in Canada.

### *Respondents’ Linguistic Limitations*

Although we aimed to choose adjectives we thought would be easily understandable, one might assume that dissimilar understandings of the adjectives would limit the significance of this study. However, the semantic



similarity hypothesis (Paunonen et al., 1992) suggests that the semantic understanding of linguistic terms is similarly understood by (a) members of different groups, given a certain level of proficiency, and (b) members within the same group.

## Discussion and Interpretation of Results

How should the above results and limitations be interpreted and what are the broader implications for teaching? Recall that an important finding was the overall similarity of CBs' and IBs' perceptions of people in Canada. We may state that CBs and IBs perceive people in Canada quite similarly and even positively. This overall similarity in perceptions was a surprising finding, as at the outset of our research we expected a more significant divergence in perceptions between the two groups. That is, we expected CBs to perceive people in Canada much more positively than IBs due to an in-group bias (Sumner, 1907), in which members of an in-group, with advantages in social and cultural capital, have more favourable perceptions of themselves than of members of an out-group, in this case IBs.

A quite surprising finding in the unprompted adjective ranking section, as noted previously, was that IBs were slightly more likely than CBs to perceive people in Canada as "friendly" (1.83 vs. 1.68 points per respondent). These findings are ambiguous but could be an affirmation that people in Canada treat newcomers with a degree of friendliness that is evident to IBs, raising questions if people in Canada are even "friendlier" to relative outsiders (IBs) than to other members of their in-group (CBs). Another interesting question is whether IBs perceive people in Canada to be relatively friendlier than the people from their home countries. Further studies are required to address these points. The IB perception of people in Canada as "friendlier" than CBs does not seem to demonstrate an in-group bias, but some in-group bias may exist, as CBs are more likely to indicate, when unprompted, that people in Canada are "polite," "kind/kindly," and "caring." This may indicate a gap in the understanding of politeness between the two groups, and similarly a gap in having an emotionally supportive social network with which they can find kindness and care. Moreover, recall that 8 CBs suggested that people in Canada were proud, but no IBs made this suggestion. This may exemplify the complexity of meaning of language; "proud" is open to interpretation to mean "loyal to one's nation" or "arrogant."

We reported that the Likert-scale analysis showed statistical significance in the difference between CBs' and IBs' likelihood of agreement on four specific adjectives: "intelligent," "funny," "caring," and "hardworking"; CBs were significantly more in agreement than IBs that people in Canada exhibit these characteristics, potentially demonstrating an in-group bias. Also, it is possible that intelligence, humour, nurture, and hard work are perceived

and manifested differently across cultures. Martin (2007) suggests that humour is associated with social integration and group cohesion. Because humour is very culturally and linguistically situated (Schmitz, 2002), the result that CBs are significantly more likely to perceive people in Canada as funny is not surprising. This is often reflected in the difficulty with which humour and jokes are taught in ESL classrooms. Similar to the cultural intricacies of perceiving humour, it can be suggested that perceptions of intelligence and hard work are culturally embedded. Given a particular problem, for example, the intelligent and/or appropriate reaction if a student were to disagree with an instructor would vary across cultures and accordingly be perceived differently. Similarly, the expectations of work quality and quantity vary across cultures and would also be perceived accordingly. For example, according to Statistics Canada (2008), Canadians worked 36.4 hours per week on average, far less than in some Asian countries.

Whatever the causes of (a) the overall similarity in perceptions between IBs and CBs and (b) the overall positive responses of the two groups, because of (a) and (b) we may tentatively state that IBs seem to be adapting well and "fitting in" to Canadian society. We describe this similarity of perceptions as "perceptual solidarity" between CBs and IBs and an affirmation of Canada as a multicultural and accepting society. "Perceptual solidarity" occurs when two groups have congruent perceptions of a phenomenon or social group, indicating porous barriers between the groups in question. We propose that such "perceptual solidarity" reflects, or is a result of, Schumann's (1978) "social solidarity" between language learners and members of the target language community, where minimal social distance between the two groups prevails. In short, "perceptual solidarity" may or may not entail social solidarity.

Because CBs' and IBs' perceptions of people in Canada are so similar, IBs have somehow gotten an "insider view" of Canadian culture, which is only to be celebrated. As a thought experiment, consider the opposite situation: drastic and unbridgeable differences between CBs' and IBs' perceptions of people in Canada. In the absence of such extreme differences, we can conclude that some form of "acculturation" is taking place, whether in the Berry and Sam (1980) sense or not. Perhaps IBs are successfully pursuing "assimilation" or "integration" strategies of acculturation (Berry, 1997; Berry & Sam, 1980). To a greater extent than we realize, people in Canada seem to be friendly to IBs, and, additionally, IBs may be employing effective strategies to acculturate to life in Canada. Furthermore, it appears from our e-interviews that IBs are at least somewhat satisfied with their acculturation to life in Canada, although no doubt more could be done by postsecondary institutions to assist their acculturation. IBs may not be as marginalized as we might have expected prior to this research study. These results are a step toward understanding how IBs are adapting and/or acculturating to Canadian society.

### *Other Specific Applications to Language Teaching*

Recall that, in weighted ranking analysis, CBs were more likely than IBs to mention that people in Canada were “polite” (1.57 vs. 1.05 points per respondent). This difference may indicate that IBs apply their own norms of politeness to everyday Canadian situations, as such norms vary cross-culturally. Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989) found that “even fairly advanced language learners’ communicative acts regularly contain pragmatic errors, or deficits, in that they fail to convey or comprehend the intended illocutionary force or politeness value” (p. 10). Furthermore, it has been suggested that pragmatic development may be inhibited in the absence of classroom instruction (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; McLean, 2004). Therefore, the findings of this study suggest that it is worthwhile for Canadian language teachers to spend more time in their classrooms explaining and discussing norms of “Canadian” politeness to IBs and how these norms might vary, if at all, from IBs’ own cultures. Similarly, sociolinguistic forms of politeness in Canadian English should be carefully attended to by both language teachers and learners. Such explanation and discussion could occur informally and spontaneously or in a more structured manner as part of a sociopragmatic lesson (or series of lessons) on politeness in Canada. It should be added that we have no doubt that such explanation and discussion is already occurring in Canadian language classrooms; we are merely highlighting their importance.

Similarly, opportunities to explain and discuss other aspects of Canadian culture (e.g., history, politics, and perhaps even humour) should be fully exploited by language teachers. Recall that in one of the e-interviews an IB respondent wished to have more Canadian cultural background knowledge in politics, history, and general knowledge to better acculturate to Canadian society.

It may be worth noting that IBs, with lower perceptions of people in Canada as “kind/kindly” or “caring,” may be in need of a stronger social support network. This may be an interesting area of exploration for ELT school administrators and extracurricular support staff.

It can be concluded that much more research is desired on the topic of acculturation of international students. As sample size is a limiting factor in this study, it is recommended that a follow-up study with a much larger sample size and more representative sample be conducted, which would allow an opportunity to determine statistically significant correlations between the background information of the respondents and their perceptions. Moreover, international student acculturation, in addition to being a significant issue in Canada, is also a significant issue in many other countries that are similarly experiencing a surge of international students. Research studies in a non-Canadian context would shed more light on the topic and enable a comparison between the results of this study and of an internationally conducted study with similar methodology.

## Notes

- 1 Consent was received from York University's Office of Research Ethics.
- 2 Although Hofstede (1980) was a key influence on our research, as discussed previously, we rejected the wholesale adoption of his five-dimension taxonomy (power distance, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance, and long-term orientation) as being too restrictive for our purposes of exploring CB's/IB's perceptions of people in Canada.
- 3 For example, "conservative" was not selected because it describes too many different cultural facets: politics, economics, or even fashion.
- 4 <http://vimeo.com/18546862>
- 5 In an unpaired *t*-test, a *p*-value less than 0.05 is considered significant by statistical standards, meaning that the difference demonstrated between groups is more than simply coincidence and that in 95 out of 100 cases the results would be reproduced if the study was replicated. A *p*-value higher than 0.05 is statistically insignificant, meaning that any difference that resulted between the two groups is inconclusive.
- 6 The quotations have not been edited for grammar or spelling errors when reproduced in this manuscript.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the following people for their support and direction: Calum MacKechnie, Joanne Millard, Nick Elson, Andre Schmid, Paul Ward, Andrew Gordon, Paul Elo, and George Siemens. We would also like to thank our Twitter followers, Facebook friends, coworkers and fellow instructors at YUELI for helping with our survey outreach. In addition, we are grateful to the audience members from our TESL Canada and TESL Ontario conference paper presentations for their encouragement and insight.

## The Authors

*Shira Packer, M.A.*, teaches full-time at the York University English Language Institute and has many years of experience as an instructor and curriculum developer. She has taught in various settings including ESL, EAP, ESP, and teacher training in various countries such as Canada, China, and Brazil.

*Dana Lynch, M.A.*, teaches full-time at the York University English Language Institute and has taught at various postsecondary institutions in Canada. He has taught ESL, EFL, and EAP in Korea and Canada over the past 15 years.

## References

- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13–32). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology*, 46(1), 5–34.
- Berry, J. W., & Sam, D. (1980). Acculturation and adaptation. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Social behaviour and applications* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 291–326). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Albex.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Byram, M., Barrett, M., Ipgrave, J., Jackson, R., & Méndez García, M. C. (2009). *Autobiography of intercultural encounters*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe, Language Policy Division.

- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Cheng, L., & Fox, J. (2008). Towards a better understanding of academic acculturation: Second language students in Canadian universities. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 65(2), 307–333.
- City Data Forum. (2011). *Canadians are so polite*. . . Retrieved from <http://www.city-data.com/forum/canada/1324971-canadians-so-polite.html>
- Cohen, A. (2007). *The unfinished Canadian: The people we are*. Toronto, ON: McClelland & Stewart.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1–17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Greirson, B. (2008, October 30). Polite to a fault: Canadians are world champs. And yes, we actually did invent it. *Canadian Tourism Commission*. Retrieved from <http://schools.hwdsb.on.ca/sherwood/files/2011/01/Polite-to-a-fault.doc>
- Gwyn, R. (2007). *John A: The man who made us*. Toronto, ON: Random House of Canada.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (n.d.). What about Canada? *The Hofstede Centre*. Retrieved from <http://geert-hofstede.com/canada.html>
- Hymes, D. (Ed.). (1972). *Reinventing anthropology*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Katz, D., & Braly, K. (1933). Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 28(3), 280–290.
- Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lantolf, J., & Poehner, M. E. (Eds.). (2008). *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages*. Oakville, CT: Equinox.
- Martin, R. A. (2007). *The psychology of humor: An integrative approach*. San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Matsumoto, D., & Juang, L. (2008). *Culture and psychology* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81–90.
- McLean, T. (2004). Giving students a fighting chance: Pragmatics in the language classroom. *TESL Canada Journal*, 21(2), 72–92.
- Morris, M. W., Leung, K., Ames, D., & Lickel, B. (1999). Views from inside and outside: Integrating EMIC and ETIC insights about culture and justice judgement. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 781–796.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9–31.
- Pauonon, S. V., Jackson, D. N., Trzebinski, J., & Forsterling, F. (1992). Personality structure across cultures: A multimethod evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(3), 447–456.
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Memorandum for the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist*, 38(1), 149–152.
- Schmitz, J. R. (2002). Humor as a pedagogical tool in foreign language and translation courses. *Humor*, 15(1), 89–113.
- Schumann, J. H. (1978). The acculturation model for second-language acquisition. In R. C. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (pp. 27–50). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

- Statistics Canada. (2008). *Almost one-third of working Canadians say they are workaholics*. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-008-x/2007001/9629-eng.htm#1>
- Sumner, W. G. (1907). *Folkways: A study of the sociological importance of usages, manners, customs, mores, and morals*. Boston, MA: Ginn.
- Swain, M., Kinnear, P., & Steinman, L. (2011). *Sociocultural theory in second language education: An introduction through narratives*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Tupes, E. C., & Christal, R. E. (1961). *Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings*. Lackland Air Force Base, TX: Personnel Laboratory, Air Force Systems Command.
- Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Walkom, T. (2011, October 18). It's polite, but Toronto protest lacks Canadian content. *Toronto Star*. Retrieved from [http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2011/10/18/walkom\\_its\\_polite\\_but\\_toronto\\_protest\\_lacks\\_canadian\\_content.html](http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2011/10/18/walkom_its_polite_but_toronto_protest_lacks_canadian_content.html)
- Williams, J. E., Satterwhite, R. C., & Saiz, J. L. (1998). *The importance of psychological traits: A cross-cultural study*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

## Appendix A

### Perceptions of People in Canada Survey

1. I am fully aware of the nature and extent of my participation in this research as described above. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I can withdraw at any time. I acknowledge receipt of a description of the project, and agree to participate.
    - I agree       I do not agree
  2. Are you currently a full-time student at a Canadian postsecondary institution (university or college)?
    - No       Yes
  3. Have you attended a Canadian postsecondary institution (university or college) as a full-time student for any amount of time in the last 5 years?
    - No       Yes
- [[[If 'no' to Q3, end survey.]]]
4. What is your age?
    - less than 18       18-24       25-34       35-44       45 +
  5. Are you
    - male or       female?
  6. Please indicate your highest level of education completed (check only one box):
    - High school       Bachelors       Masters       Ph.D.
  7. Please indicate your area(s) of study (select one or more): \_\_\_\_\_
  8. Please indicate the Canadian college(s) or university(-ies) you have attended. Please choose all that apply. \_\_\_\_\_
  9. What is/are your first language(s)? \_\_\_\_\_
  10. Which other languages can you speak in addition to your first language and English? \_\_\_\_\_

11. In what country are you currently living?  
 Canada       A country other than Canada
12. In what Canadian city(-ies) do/did you live? \_\_\_\_\_
13. In what country were you born? \_\_\_\_\_

*[[[If answer to Q13 is 'Canada', respondent answers Q14-Q16.]]]:*

14. How many years have you spent living outside Canada (if at all)?  
 less than one year                       more than 3 years - 5 years  
 more than 1 year - 2 years               more than 5 years - 10 years  
 more than 2 years - 3 years               more than 10 years
15. For how many generations has your father lived in Canada?  
 one generation (he immigrated)  
 two generations (his parents were immigrants)  
 three generations (at least some of his grandparents were immigrants)  
 more than three generations
16. For how many generations has your mother lived in Canada?  
 one generation (she immigrated)  
 two generations (her parents were immigrants)  
 three generations (at least some of her grandparents were immigrants)  
 more than three generations

*[[[End of background questions for Canadian-born students (CBs)]]]*

*[[[If answer to Q13 is a country other than 'Canada', respondent answers Q17-Q21.]]]:*

17. For how long have you been/ were you in Canada? (if multiple visits, please indicate total time)  
 1 month or less                               more than 2 years - 3 years  
 more than 1 month - 6 months           more than 3 years - 5 years  
 more than 6 months - 1 year               more than 5 years - 10 years  
 more than 1 year - 2 years                   more than 10 years
18. If you are currently living in Canada, for how long do you expect to stay in Canada?  
 6 months or less                               more than 3 years - 5 years  
 more than 6 months - 1 year               more than 5 years - 10 years  
 more than 1 year - 2 years                   I have already left Canada  
 more than 2 years - 3 years
19. Before coming to Canada, what type(s) of English-language education course(s) did you take in your country of birth? (select one or more)  
 University English course(s)               English language school course(s)  
 High school English course(s)               None  
 Elementary school English course(s)

20. Please indicate how long (in total) you studied English in your country of birth before coming to Canada:

- 6 months or less
- more than 6 months - 1 year
- more than 1 year - 3 years
- more than 3 years - 5 years
- more than 5 years - 10 years
- more than 10 years

21. In your opinion, in your daily life in Canada, how much contact do/did you have with native-born Canadians?

Amount of contact with native-born Canadians

- Very little
- A little
- A lot
- Quite a lot

*[[[End of background questions for internationally-born students (IBs)]]]*

22. Think about all of the people you've met in Canada. What are 5 personality traits (characteristics or adjectives) that you think of to describe them? Personality traits are those that describe the way that people act, not look.

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_

23. To what extent do you agree with the following statements, where 1 represents strongly disagree and 5 represents strongly agree:

People in Canada are FRIENDLY	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are PEACEFUL	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are HELPFUL	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are POLITE	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are SELFISH	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are RESPECTFUL	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are LOYAL	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are COMPETITIVE	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are OPEN-MINDED	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are CARING	1	2	3	4	5

24. One more time: To what extent do you agree with the following statements, where 1 represents strongly disagree and 5 represents strongly agree:

People in Canada are HONEST	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are MODEST	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are FUNNY	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are HARDWORKING	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are SELF-CONFIDENT	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are BORING	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are COOPERATIVE	1	2	3	4	5
People in Canada are OPTIMISTIC	1	2	3	4	5



- |                                    |   |   |   |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| People in Canada are DISSATISFIED  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| People in Canada are MATERIALISTIC | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
25. Last time: To what extent do you agree with the following statements, where 1 represents strongly disagree and 5 represents strongly agree:
- |                                      |   |   |   |   |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| People in Canada are RISK-TAKING     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| People in Canada are EASYGOING       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| People in Canada are PATIENT         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| People in Canada are OUTGOING        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| People in Canada are GENEROUS        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| People in Canada are COLD            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| People in Canada are AFRAID          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| People in Canada are INDIVIDUALISTIC | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| People in Canada are RELIABLE        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| People in Canada are INTELLIGENT     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
26. I give permission for the researchers to contact and interview me about my answers:
- Yes     No
27. Please provide your email address:

## **Appendix B**

### **Follow-up E-Interview Questions**

1. How would you define your identity? (You may include information about ethnicity, religion, nation, age, gender, family relationships, or membership in a group.)
2. Please think about a positive experience that you had with a person or a group of people in Canada.
  - a. Describe the setting and the relationship of the people involved
  - b. Describe the experience
  - c. How would you describe the other person(s)?
  - d. Why would you define this as a positive experience?
  - e. Do you think that this experience is representative (or typical) of people in Canada?
3. Please think about a negative experience that you had with a person or a group of people in Canada.
  - a. Describe the setting and the relationship of the people involved
  - b. Describe the experience
  - c. How would you describe the other person(s)?
  - d. Why would you define this as a negative experience?
  - e. Do you think that this experience is representative (or typical) of people in Canada?

## Appendix C

### List of Survey Respondents' Postsecondary Institutions

Note: The following institutions had at least 1 respondent to our survey; institutions with the most responses are bolded and show the number of respondents in parentheses.

1. Acadia University
2. Algonquin College of Applied Arts and Technology
3. Athabasca University
4. Aurora College
5. Bishop's University
6. Brandon University
7. British Columbia Institute of Technology
8. Brock University
9. Canadian Mennonite University
10. Canadore College of Applied Arts and Technology
11. Cape Breton University
12. Capilano University
13. Carleton University
14. Centennial College of Applied Arts and Technology
15. Collège universitaire de Saint-Boniface
16. College of New Caledonia
17. College of the North Atlantic
18. Concordia University
19. Crandall University
- 20. Dalhousie University (10)**
21. École polytechnique de Montréal
22. Fanshawe College of Applied Arts and Technology
23. George Brown College of Applied Arts and Technology
24. HEC Montréal
- 25. Humber Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning (10)**
26. Huron College
27. Keyano College
28. Kwantlen Polytechnic University
29. Langara College
30. Laurentian University
- 31. McGill University (11)**
32. McMaster University
33. Medicine Hat College
34. Memorial University of Newfoundland
35. Mohawk College of Applied Arts and Technology
36. Mount Royal University
37. Mount Saint Vincent University
38. MTI Community College
39. Nipissing University
40. North Island College
41. Northern Alberta Institute of Technology
42. Nova Scotia Community College (various campuses)
43. OCAD University
- 44. Queen's University (14)**
45. Redeemer University College
46. Ryerson University
47. Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology
48. Sheridan College of Applied Arts and Technology
49. Simon Fraser University
50. Sir Sandford Fleming College of Applied Arts and Technology
51. Southern Alberta Institute of Technology
52. St. Lawrence College
53. St. Thomas University
54. Thompson Rivers University
55. Trent University
56. Université de Montréal
57. Université de Sherbrooke
58. Université du Québec à Chicoutimi

59. Université du Québec à Montréal
60. Université Laval
61. University of the Fraser Valley
- 62. University of Alberta (6)**
- 63. University of British Columbia (6)**
64. University of Calgary
65. University of Guelph
66. University of King's College
67. University of Lethbridge
68. University of Manitoba
69. University of New Brunswick
70. University of Northern British Columbia
71. University of Ontario Institute of Technology
72. University of Prince Edward Island
73. University of Regina
74. University of Saskatchewan
- 75. University of Toronto (36)**
76. University of Victoria
77. University of Waterloo
78. University of Western Ontario
79. University of Windsor
80. Vancouver Community College
81. Wilfrid Laurier University
- 82. York University (119)**
83. Yukon College