

# OFDE

Observatoire sur la Formation  
à la Diversité et l'Équité.

***Findings from the Survey on the effects of Bill 21 on Faculties and Departments of Education in Quebec universities, their students and personnel – Executive Summary***

# Prepared by the members of the inter-university working from the Observatoire sur la formation à la diversité et l'équité (OFDE) :

Maryse Potvin, Professor, Université du Québec à Montréal  
Lucian Nenciovici, Ph.D. candidate, Université du Québec à Montréal  
Emmanuelle Doré, Professor, Université de Sherbrooke  
Stéphanie Tremblay, Professor, Université du Québec à Montréal  
Stéphanie Demers, Professor, Université du Québec en Outaouais  
Bronwen Low, Professor, Université McGill  
David Lefrançois, Professor, Université du Québec en Outaouais  
Marilyn Steinbach, Professor, Université de Sherbrooke  
Leonidas Nsabimana, Ph.D. candidate, Université du Québec en Outaouais

Catalogage avant publication de Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec et Bibliothèque  
et Archives Canada

Includes references.

Electronic monograph in PDF format.

ISBN 978-2-924536-11-7

Legal deposit : Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec, Bibliothèque et Archives Canada, 2020  
© Observatoire sur la formation à la diversité et l'équité (OFDE), 2020

With the financial support of our partners



# I. OBJECTIVES

## Objectives and description of the survey questionnaire and analysis

This survey aimed to determine the effects of Bill 21 (“Act respecting the laicity of the State”) on faculties and departments of education in Quebec universities, their students and staff. An inter-university working group composed of members from the OFDE created an online survey questionnaire using LimeSurvey. Both French and English versions were made available to respondents. The survey was conducted in Quebec universities during March and April 2020. Comprised of five parts with both closed-ended (following a Likert response scale) and open-ended questions, it allowed respondents to include concrete examples and share their experiences<sup>1</sup>.

- Part A aimed to collect general information regarding respondents, namely : (i) type of university and school personnel (professor, language instructor, sessional lecturer, field supervisor or co-operating teacher, school administration or support staff), and category of student (undergraduate or graduate) ; (ii) gender ; (iii) age group ; (iv) migratory status (non-immigrant, born in Canada with at least one immigrant parent [2<sup>nd</sup> generation], first generation immigrant, First Nations) ; (v) first language(s) ; (vi) identifying as a visible or religious minority ; (vii) university affiliation.
- Part B sought to determine whether **measures were implemented** by respondents' university, faculty or department in response to Bill 21.
- Part C was divided into two sections. The first **(C1a)** concerned respondents from the five professional categories and aimed to determine whether student teachers from their university, faculty, or department had reported that they had experienced **negative or discriminatory treatment** in the wake of Bill 21, and whether **(C1b) measures** had been adopted by their institution to prevent or avoid discriminatory treatment of student teachers relating to Bill 21. The second part of this section of the survey questionnaire **(C2)** asked students **(C2a)** whether they had been **victims of or witness to forms of negative or discriminatory treatment** in the course of their studies after Bill 21 passed into law. **(C2b)** sought to determine whether students had been informed of any measures taken by their university to prevent or avoid discriminatory treatment of student teachers relating to Bill 21.
- Part D also contained two sections. The first **(D1)** only concerned respondents who were university or school personnel, and aimed to determine whether any **modifications had been made to their teacher education program**, including course content relating to secularism, individual rights and freedoms, inclusion, or reasonable accommodation, in the wake of Bill 21. The second section **(D2)** was directed at all respondents, and aimed to determine

---

<sup>1</sup> The survey questionnaire and complete report will be available online in January 2021, on the Observatoire sur la formation à la diversité et l'équité website (ofde.ca). Analysis was restricted to completed questionnaires only (N = 972 of 1875 recorded questionnaires). Data collected was submitted to descriptive analysis reporting frequencies and percentages. Respondents' answers to the open-ended questions were analyzed using emergent categories (grounded theory), with QDA Miner. Key findings from these resultats are presented below.

whether they had **witnessed confrontations** in class, or had heard hurtful comments associated with Bill 21.

- Part E was also divided into two sections. The first **(E1)** was directed at university personnel and aimed to determine whether they had observed **negative consequences** relating to Bill 21 on **(E1a) relationships** between members of their university, faculty, or department personnel, and on **(E1b) relationships** between members in their university, faculty, or department personnel and partner schools' personnel or parents (teachers, administrators, support staff, etc.). The second section **(E2)** was directed at students only and similarly sought to determine whether they had observed negative consequences relating to Bill 21 on relationships between students and university personnel, or between students and school personnel or parents.

## II. PART A

### General information regarding respondents

- 914 respondents out of a total of 972 (94 %), completed the French version of the survey questionnaire, and 58 respondents (6%) completed the English version;
- Among respondents associated with universities, those who responded in greater numbers were field supervisors or co-operating teachers (26,0 %) and undergraduate students (27,8 %): a cumulative percentage of just over 50 % of respondents are from these two categories. Graduate students (15,7 %), professors (15,3 %), sessional lecturers (12,7 %), and administrative personnel (1,5%) or school administrators (0,9 %) complete the categories of respondents.
- Around three times more women (74,0 %) than men (25,5 %) completed the survey;
- Among age groups, respondents age 18 to 29 years (26,3 %) and 40 to 49 years (27,9 %) had the greatest response rate: a little over 50 % of respondents are from these two age groups ;
- The majority of respondents (72,3 %) are non-immigrants ;
- The majority of respondents (78,7 %) identified French as a first language ;
- Over one in ten respondents (11,9 %) identify as belonging to a visible or religious minority ;
- Universities with the highest rate of response were UQAM (31,6 %), Université de Sherbrooke (22,2 %), Université de Montréal (10,1 %), to which over 60 % of respondents were affiliated.

## III. PART B

### Measures undertaken by universities

Among the 549 university personnel respondents, the majority (364, 66,3 %) did not know whether their department, faculty, or university had undertaken any action relating to Bill 21. Among the remaining 185 respondents, 53 (9,7 %) indicated that some action had been undertaken. These respondents were mostly in executive positions (55,6 %) and members of administrative staff (20,0 %), from McGill University (50,0 %), Université du Québec en Outaouais (16,0 %), Université du Québec à Montréal (14,6 %), and Université de Montréal (7,8 %).

In total, 53 comments were recorded regarding action undertaken by universities, most from professors, field supervisors, and sessional lecturers. These actions mostly relate to statements of institutional position in regard to Bill 21 (n = 30), transmission of information (n = 22), supportive measures for students (n = 15), and strict application of the law (n=5). The following are examples :

- Positions taken by the Academic council, faculty union, department or faculty ;
- Directives for field supervisors “ *no information allowing to identify a student should be collected or transmitted to school boards* ” ;
- “ Resolution calling for the modification of field placement for student teachers with religious symbols who experience hostility in the initial placement ” ;
- A letter of information concerning the fact the law does not apply to student teachers, and directing student teachers toward school boards that do not apply the law.

## IV. PART C

### Negative or discriminatory treatment and institutional measures

#### Negative treatment of student teachers according to personnel (C1a)

Among the 549 university personnel respondents, almost half (48,3 %) indicated not knowing whether their department, faculty or university's student teachers had reported experiences of negative or discriminatory treatment related to Bill 21. 284 respondents (51,8 %) indicated knowing whether such reports had been made. Among these 284 respondents, 36 (6,6 %) declared knowing that cases of negative or discriminatory treatment had been reported by student teachers. These respondents were mostly executives (33,3 % of those who answered “ Yes ”), and members of administrative or support personnel (13,3 % of those who answered “ Yes ”), from McGill University

(50,0 %), Université du Québec en Outaouais (16,0 %), Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue (10,0 %), and Université de Montréal (9,1 %).

Of the 47 comments collected through open-ended questions, mostly from professors and field supervisors (n=39), negative and discriminatory comments or acts account for most manifestations of discriminatory treatment described by respondents (n=18), followed by effects on academic achievement and professional integration (n=13), attitudes and “looks” (n=7), effects on individual rights and freedoms (n=6), and psychological effects (n=3). Most of the discriminatory acts reported in the questionnaire originated from cooperating teachers or school board personnel in regard to the wearing religious symbols and took place at different stages of the field experience (interview, assessment), even though student teachers are not school board employees, and the law does not apply to them. The following are examples of the comments collected :

- “ Inappropriate, hateful looks ” ;
- “ Student teacher wearing a headscarf was asked whether she intended to take it off ” ;
- “ Women wearing a headscarf not allowed to undertake field experience ” ;
- “ Student teacher reports that her cooperating teacher justified failing her because she wears a headscarf ” ;
- “ Some cooperating teachers make baseless disparaging comments in front of students ” ;
- “ Prejudicial comments from school personnel during field experience (ie. overtly expressing their support for the law in front of the student teacher who is in a vulnerable position, as an intern) ” .

Some comments suggest that the implementation of Bill 21 has legitimized such discriminatory acts, comments, or hostile behaviors towards student teachers who wear a religious symbol in the field, at partner schools.

### Institutional measures according to personnel (C1b)

Of the 118 (21,5 %) university personnel respondents who answered «yes» or «no» to questions regarding whether their institution had taken measures to prevent or avoid discriminatory situations for student teachers relating to Bill 21, 30 (5,5 %) indicated that their institution had taken such measures. The proportion of positive responses is once again highest among executives (33,3 %), followed by professors (8,7 %), most frequently at McGill University (21,4 %), Université du Québec à Montréal (9,9 %), Université du Québec en Outaouais (8,0 %), and Université de Montréal (6,5 %). Comparison with responses to items from the previous section suggests a certain congruence within universities between (i) the scope of negative or discriminatory treatment reported by student teachers related to Bill 21 and (ii) the scope of measures implemented by universities to counter these situations.

Examples supplied by university personnel of measures taken to prevent or avoid discriminatory situations (n=28) are mostly provided by teaching staff (professors, sessional lecturers or language instructors) (79 %), followed by field supervisors or co-operating teachers (11 %), executives (7 %), and administrative personnel (4 %). Respondents mostly identified measures such as statements of institutional position regarding Bill 21 (18 %), actions supporting students (57 %), and transmission of information (25 %) – eg. “ letter sent to partner school ” or “ change in student teacher's placement ”.

## Students reporting being victims of or witness to negative or discriminatory treatment (C2a)

Among the 423 student respondents, 418 (98,8 %) indicated whether or not they had been victims of or witness to negative or discriminatory treatment related to Bill 21. Of these 418, 70 (16,5 %) indicated that they had been victims of or witness to negative or discriminatory treatment related to Bill 21. This proportion of affirmative answers is greater than the proportion found among university personnel respondents (6,6 %), indicating that student teachers experience – or perceive that they experience – more negative or discriminatory treatment related to Bill 21 than what is known by the university personnel surveyed. The fact that **one out of six students** answered this question in the affirmative **indicates that negative or discriminatory treatment related to Bill 21 may potentially be more widespread than data from universities suggests**. The proportion of affirmative answers is higher among undergraduate students (19,6 %) than among graduate students (11,1 %), and at Concordia University (41,4 %), Université de Montréal (28,6%), Université du Québec à Montréal (26,5 %), and Université du Québec à Chicoutimi (8,3 %).

The survey questionnaire allowed us to collect 70 comments describing the various forms of negative or discriminatory treatment which students experienced as victims or witnesses, as well their effects. Comments mainly pertain to acts or comments (37%), attitudes and “looks” (8%), as well as effects on individual rights and freedoms (24%), psychological effects (6%), or effects on academic achievement or professional integration (5%). Students described incidents of direct discrimination resulting from the polarized climate generated by Bill 21, for example, cases of intimidation by other students, and discriminatory acts by people in positions of authority within the university (professors or field supervisors), but mainly in the field, within partner schools (cooperating teachers). They note suspicious or hateful looks, stigmatizing comments, refusal of student teacher placement, and insistent questions concerning students' intentions to continue wearing the headscarf.

- “Students reported being excluded from teamwork in class, by their classmates or their professor” ;
- They also told of being subjected to hateful comments from their cooperating teacher or field supervisor, such as : “ we don't want a teacher who'll convert our students ” or “ this isn't Hallowe'en, we don't want women wearing costumes at work ”, or “ Go back to your country. We don't want people like you here ”.

These behaviors have repercussions on academic achievement and the professional integration of student teachers. Some have dropped out of or failed their field experience as a consequence of a strict ban on wearing of religious symbols; others had to be assigned to partner schools further from the university. Some students have been forced to remove their headscarf to maintain their placement. Others have abandoned their program as a consequence of being forbidden now and in the future from wearing a religious symbol in order to practice their chosen profession. Many comments denounced situations in which students were excluded from the substitute teacher list, without any prior verification regarding their intention to wear a religious symbol. Many report feeling belittled, inferior, anxious, distressed, and discouraged.

## Institutional measures according to students (C2b)

Among the 423 student respondents, only 51 (12,1 %) indicated that they had been informed that measures had been taken by the university to prevent or avoid discriminatory situations related to Bill 21. The proportion of affirmative answers is again higher among undergraduate students than among graduate students (13,3 % compared to 9,8 %), which suggests that they are more greatly impacted by Bill 21, especially at Concordia University (34,5 %), Université du Québec en Outaouais (21,4 %), and Université du Québec à Montréal (21,3 %). Comparing these proportions with those from the previous group (C2a) suggests that there is here a certain congruence within universities between (i) the scope of negative or discriminatory treatment reported by student teachers related to Bill 21 and (ii) the scope of measures implemented by universities to counter these situations.

Students provided 72 comments regarding measures undertaken by their university, mainly : 1) transmission of information (n = 34) by their faculty and student association, including the information transmitted to partner schools in order to inform, raise awareness, and prevent discrimination related to Bill 21 ; 2) supportive measures for students (n = 22) to compensate for any discriminatory effects of the law, such as the possibility of changing a field experience placement; and, 3) institutional statements (n = 15) including faculty resolutions expressing concern about or resistance to Bill 21, votes on strike mandates, demonstrations, etc. According to the comments collected in the survey, measures taken by universities reflect a central concern : ensuring the respect of the rights and freedoms of students at risk of negative or discriminatory treatment.

Among student respondents, four factors appear to increase the likelihood of being the victim of or witness to negative or discriminatory treatment related to Bill 21 : (i) identifying as female (19,6 % v. 7,1 %), (ii) being a first generation immigrant (36,3 %) or a second generation immigrant (30,8 %) compared to being a non-immigrant (third generation or greater) (8,7 %), (iii) having a first language other than French (English [37,5 %], allophone [38,6 %], compared to French [9,8 %]); and (iv) belonging to a visible or religious minority (39,2 % v. 11,3 %).



## V. PART D

### Modifications to the teacher education program

#### Modifications to the teacher education program according to university personnel (D1)

Among the 549 university personnel respondents, 200 (36,5 %) indicated whether or not they knew if modifications had been made to their teacher education program in the wake of Bill 21. Only 14 (2,6 %) indicated that this had been the case, mainly sessional lecturers (4,9 %), professors or language instructors (4,7 %). These proportions of affirmative answers are lower than for previous questionnaire items, and originate mainly from Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue (10,0 %), Université du Québec à Rimouski (7,7 %), Université du Québec à Chicoutimi (7,7 %), and McGill University (7,1 %).

Some details regarding modifications made to the teacher education program (n = 15) indicate that they are mainly pedagogical in nature (n = 12) or related to the transmission of information about Bill 21 in class (n = 3). Comments mentioned the addition of course content regarding concepts of inclusion and diversity, the presentation of Bill 21, discussions pertaining to the Bill and its effects, the relationship between Bill 21 and the *Orientations for professional competencies in Teacher Training*, and the development of an inclusive learning context. These modifications were, for example, described in the following terms

- “Explanation of Bill 21 in course content in relation to interculturality” ;
- “ My position as a pedagogue has tended toward the respect of differences, working with differences, providing students with a posture which welcomes these differences and serves as an example of how to develop such a posture ”.

#### Increased classroom confrontation according to all categories of respondents (D2)

All of the 972 respondents, personnel and students (100,0 %), answered whether or not they had witnessed more conflictual classroom interactions or hurtful comments in the wake of Bill 21. 88 respondents (9,1 %), around one out of eleven, indicated having witnessed such confrontations or comments. This suggests that Bill 21 generated an increase in such incidents which, in spite of their limited scope, appear significant. The proportion of affirmative answers is highest among undergraduate students (16,3 %), followed by professors and language instructors (8,1 %). These results again suggest that undergraduate students, undergoing field experience, are more significantly impacted by Bill 21, especially if they are studying at McGill University (35,7 %), Concordia University (28,6 %), Université Laval (15,8 %), and Université du Québec à Montréal

(12,7 %). Comparing results from this category with the previous category (D1) suggests that the repercussions of Bill 21 are more widespread within some universities, Concordia University and the UQAM comprising the top four of both categories.

In all, 68 confrontations were described by respondents, mostly by students (n=50), followed by personnel (n=18), mainly professors, sessional lecturers, and language instructors (n=7), as well as field supervisors and cooperating teachers (n=11). These descriptions allowed us to define types of conflictual interactions (action or comment; attitude or look); their effects (psychological; effects on rights and freedoms or on academic achievement or professional integration); comments pertaining to postures as witness, victim or perpetrator of intimidation; where the event occurred (university bodies, classroom or public space, partner school context), and the stand taken or reported (in favor of or against Bill 21). Among all categories of respondents, examples of acts of intimidation (notably of an islamophobic nature) and polarizing comments are more frequently reported than attitudes or looks. They also most often originate from other students or university teaching staff. This is described in the following comments: "*Teaching staff often avoid the subject by not talking about it at all in class. Also, female students are worried.*"

Students identifying as victims or witnesses of these confrontations point to a radical change in attitudes toward women who wear the headscarf before and following Bill 21 becoming law, in class;

"During classroom debates, students with strong opinions about Bill 21 targeted women in the group who wear the headscarf ("what do you think ?, etc. "); "It's just one political opinion and we have to conform to it in order to not be excluded from social groups at school. It's propaganda, brainwashing, and restricts freedom of expression".

as well as online;

"Racist and disparaging comments about arab cultures on the university website".

during events;

"Students throwing their peers hateful and intolerant looks during a football game".

or during administrative meetings.

"In a pre-semester meeting, an administrator refuses to discuss Bill 21, invoking an absence of problems relating to the Bill in their university".

Effects are mostly psychological;

“ During a university class, a student wearing the headscarf cried as she spoke up during a discussion on Bill 21, explaining that she always had to work twice as hard as others and felt like she walked into schools at a disadvantage, simply because she wears a headscarf ! ”

related to isolation;

“ I've observed isolation and discomfort. It's not so much words that are spoken, but I've noticed a lesser integration of students who wear the headscarf in the class dynamics”.

or to violations of rights and freedoms.

“ Some colleagues discussing Bill 21 in the staff room saying things like “this is Quebec, education has to be secular here...”, “These kinds of things don't have their place in schools...”, “ All they have to do to keep their job is remove their headscarf, it's not that complicated, seems to me !” and these comments were made without any concern about whether a person wearing a headscarf (or any other symbol) was in the room. This inevitably created an unhealthy climate (and a violent climate for those who wear religious symbols) between colleagues in the same school ”.

Among all respondents (personnel and students combined), four factors increase the likelihood of having witnessed more conflictual interactions in class or having heard hurtful comments since Bill 21 was passed : (i) being younger (18 to 39 years [ $> 10$  %] compared with those age 40 or more [ $\leq 5$  %]) ; (ii) being of immigrant background (first generation [14,4 %] or second generation [16,7 %] compared with non-immigrants [6,7 %]) ; (iii) having a first language other than French (English [28,6 %] or allophone [17,1 %] compared to French [6,4 %]) ; (iv) belonging to a visible or religious minority (23,3 % compared with 7,1 % of those who do not belong to a visible or religious minority).

## VI. PART E

### Negative effects on relationships

#### Negative effects on relationships between members of university personnel (E1a)

Among the 549 university personnel respondents, 469 (85,5 %) indicated whether or not they had observed negative effects related to Bill 21 on relationships between members of their department, faculty, or university personnel. Only 25 respondents (4,6 %) indicated having observed such effects, mainly professors or language instructors (7,4 %), and members of administrative or support personnel (6,7 %), at the Université du Québec à Rimouski (15,4 %), McGill University (14,3 %), Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières (9,1 %), and Université du Québec en Outaouais (8,0 %).

Comments collected through the survey (n=25), were mostly provided by professors, sessional lecturers and language instructors (n=14), as well as field supervisors and cooperating teachers (n= 9), who observed tensions and polarization of positions (“ *Open tensions between people with opposing viewpoints. Insults. Reduced sense of solidarity.* ” ) and related a number of cases of negative interactions with colleagues :

- “A professor from my department saying it's "normal" and "right" that a teacher not wear a scarf on her head. ”;
- “Discriminatory comments were made by colleagues in agreement with Bill 21. Among others, during a faculty meeting about adopting a resolution to protect student teachers. ” ;
- “A professor saying that wearing a headscarf is proof that you don't accept the culture here. ”;
- “Comments mostly target the headscarf and employability ... even if there's an job opening... because I was working at the guidance and career counselling services; some consider Muslims to be dishonest, ready to abuse the system.”;
- “ We are witnessing prejudice and unreported racist comments. Favoritism between non immigrants and immigrants.”

Many comments point to the effects on individual rights and freedoms, generated by problematic climate and relationships, as well as psychological effects related to victims' feelings of not being recognized as a human being, of injustice, of fearing the consequences of affirming their faith, of self-exclusion.

Two factors appear to increase the likelihood of observing negative effects of Bill 21 on relationships between members of university personnel : (i) having a first language other than French (English = 15,8 %, allophone = 8,5 % v French as a first language =3,6 %); and, (ii) belonging to a visible or religious minority (10,8%).

## Effects on relationships between members of university personnel and partner schools, according to personnel and parents (E1b)

Among the 549 university personnel respondents, 495 (86,5 %) indicated whether or not they had observed negative effects related to Bill 21 on the relationship between members of their university's personnel and partner school personnel and parents. 23 respondents (4,2 %) indicated that they had observed such effects, mainly executives (11,1 %) and administrative and support personnel (6,7 %), at McGill University (14,3 %), Université du Québec à Montréal (7,0 %), and Université du Québec en Outaouais (4,0 %).

A total of 23 comments were provided, mainly by field supervisors and cooperating teachers (n=10), as well as professors, sessional lecturers and language instructors (n=11). Their observations corroborate those reported by student teachers, who also describe the effects of Bill 21 on their field experience. Observations range from comments (ie. : *a parent declaring about a student teacher wearing the headscarf «I don't want the one with the scarf!»*) to violent interactions between members of the school community (ie : " parents who are disrespectful and yell " ; " islamophobic comments from students' parents or students themselves " ; " unease in the staff lounge during discussions ").

Two factors increase the likelihood of having observed negative effects relating to Bill 21 on relationships between members of the university's personnel and those of the partner school community : (i) being age 30 to 39 (8,5 %) compared to other age groups (between 0,0 % and 4,1 %) and (ii) being allophone (8,5 %) compared with francophone (3,3 %).

## Effects on various relationships, according to students (E2)

Among the 423 student respondents, all (100,0 %) indicated whether or not they had observed negative effects related to Bill 21 on relationships between students, between students and members of their university's personnel, or between students and members of the partner school personnel or parents. Only 57 (13,5 %) students indicated having observed such effects. The proportion of affirmative answers are highest among undergraduate students (18,1 % v. 5,2 %), and at Université de Montréal (33,3 %), Université du Québec à Montréal (22,8 %), Concordia University (20,7 %), and McGill University (14,3 %).

Details or comments pertaining to these negative effects (n=57) were provided mainly by undergraduate students (n= 49 v. n=8). Negative effects on the relationship between students and members of their university's personnel, or members of the partner school personnel or parents were of three types : effects on interpersonal relationships (n=5), on the social or professional climate (n=12), and open conflict (n = 3) (ie. " Verbal confrontations " ; " Discussions between a student and a sessional lecturer with opposing opinions about Bill 21. It wasn't the topic of the class. "). Students are more often victims than witnesses. They report observing a legitimization of

discourse based on racist prejudice from members of both the university and the school community (parents, teaching staff, etc.) with negative effects on climate. The following are examples of all three types of effects :

- “Teachers always ask if I’m affected by Bill 21 or not. Whether I’m allowed to wear my religious symbol or not. Having to answer bothers me every time. ” ;
- « When I expressed to my professor how the law generates problems for the Muslim minority, he invited me to reconsider my career choice and to eventually move to another province.” ;
- “Some parents are now requesting of the school that their child not be with a specific teacher because he/she wears a religious symbol. This is very negative since parents are showing their kids that it’s ‘okay to not like a certain type of religion’ even when we live in a society where people have different faiths. It also affects the relationship between interns and their associate teacher because if the intern wears a religious symbol, for example, and the associate teacher is for Bill 21, they will not have a good relationship.”;
- “From having substituted in high schools, I’ve noticed that racist and islamophobic people (teachers, parents) seem a lot more comfortable with asserting derogatory and disrespectful positions and with questioning the competency of women who wear a headscarf.” ;
- “Racist comments from parents about teachers who wear a headscarf.” ;
- “Many inappropriate comments on a student association’s Facebook page about Bill 21 ”.

Three factors increase the likelihood of having observed negative effects relating to Bill 21 on relationships between students, between students and members of their university’s personnel, or between students and members of the partner school personnel or parents : (i) being a first generation (21,3 %) or second generation immigrant (21,2 %) compared to non-immigrants (10,1 %) ; (ii) having a first language other than French (English = 31,3 %, allophone = 28,6 % v. French = 9,5 %), and (iii) belonging to a visible or religious minority (23,3 % v. 7,1 %).

## VII. CONCLUSION

This survey aimed to document the effects of Bill 21 (« Act respecting the laicity of the State ») on faculties and departments of education in Quebec universities, their students and personnel. Key findings presented in this executive summary point to the emergence of problematic situations since Bill 21 was passed into law, more specifically and in decreasing order of frequency these situations include : (i) **negative and discriminatory treatment of student teachers (undergraduate)** related to Bill 21, which are more frequent, normalized, overt, and even legitimized since Bill 21 passed into law; (ii) **polarization and conflictual interactions in the classroom, or hurtful comments** related to Bill 21, generating open conflicts in some cases, and (iii) **negative effects (psychological effects, effects on academic achievement and professional integration)** associated with Bill 21, affecting the relationship between university personnel, students and schools.

The survey's findings show that some respondents are at greater risk of being victims of or witness to such problematic or discriminatory situations or effects. **Vulnerability factors** include being an undergraduate student, identifying as female, being of immigrant background, having a first language other than French, and belonging to a visible or religious minority.

In addition to the problematic repercussions presented above, key survey findings also indicate that universities have **adopted specific measures** in response to Bill 21. According to survey respondents, these include: institutional procedures aimed at **preventing or avoiding discriminatory experiences** for student teachers, institutional statements in regards to Bill 21, the transmission of information to those involved in teacher education and training (including in partner schools), and modifications to course content related to secularism, reasonable accommodation, human rights and freedoms, inclusion, and diversity.

The complete report may be accessed on the *Observatoire sur la formation à la diversité et l'équité website (ofde.ca)* beginning January 2021.