



PROJECT MUSE®

Measuring Social, Cultural, and Civic Integration in Canada: The Creation of an Index and Some Applications

Lloyd L. Wong, Annette Tézli

Canadian Ethnic Studies, Volume 45, Number 3, 2013, pp. 9-37 (Article)

Published by Canadian Ethnic Studies Association

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.2013.0039>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/531083>

Measuring Social, Cultural, and Civic Integration in Canada: The Creation of an Index and Some Applications

Abstract

This paper reports on one segment of a research project that was funded by the former Prairie Metropolis Centre. The research utilizes a large quantitative data set in Canada, the Ethnic Diversity Survey, to develop a specific index to measure the social, cultural, and civic integration of immigrants in Canada and then selectively applies it for some comparative analyses. The paper begins with a definition of integration and then reviews the literature on measuring immigrant integration in Europe and the United States as well as the relevant Canadian literature that foregrounds the variables that we considered for a Canadian immigrant integration index. We then explain how, using factor analysis, our immigrant integration index is developed for Canada. Finally, the paper applies this social integration index and presents some of the results where this index is applied. More specifically, this last part of the paper presents comparative social integration index scores and analysis for: 1) nativity (comparing immigrants to the Canadian-born); 2) generational status; 3) racialized (visible) minority status; and 3) nativity by generation and racialized (visible) minority status. While there are statistically significant differences in all of these comparisons, one of our major findings is that integration, as measured by our index, is not that different between immigrants and the Canadian-born.

Résumé

Cet article présente un segment d'un projet de recherche fondé par le *Prairie Metropolis Center*. L'Enquête sur la diversité ethnique, une large bande de données collectées au Canada, nous permet de développer un répertoire précis pour mesurer l'intégration sociale, culturelle et civique des immigrés dans ce pays, puis de l'appliquer sélectivement pour en tirer quelques analyses comparatives. Après avoir défini l'intégration, nous examinons ce qui a été publié sur ces mesures en Europe et aux États-Unis, ainsi que ce qui est pertinent au Canada en faisant ressortir les variables que nous avons prises en considération pour notre répertoire. Ensuite, nous expliquons comment nous développons celui-ci en employant une analyse factorielle. Enfin, nous l'appliquons en ce qui concerne l'intégration sociale et, là où nous l'avons fait, nous présentons quelques uns de nos résultats. Plus précisément, cette dernière partie de notre article donne cette analyse et ces résultats de manière comparative pour : 1) la terre natale (comparant les immigrés aux Canadiens de naissance); 2) le statut générationnel; 3) le statut racialisé des minorités (visibles), et 4) ce même statut avec le pays de naissance par génération. Alors qu'il y a des d'importantes différences statistiques dans toutes ces comparaisons, un de nos principaux résultats est que l'intégration, telle que mesurée par notre répertoire, n'est pas si différente entre les immigrés et les Canadiens de naissance.



INTRODUCTION

This paper presents the results of work for a project entitled *An Immigrant Integration Index: A Cross-Domain Research Project* that was funded by the Prairie Metropolis Centre in the spring of 2009. The research domains involved and their respective domain leaders at that time included: Housing and Neighbourhoods (Rick Enns, Domain Leader); Family, Children, and Youth (Anna Kirova, Domain Leader); Economic and Labour Market Integration (Peter Li, Domain Leader); Welcoming Communities (Darren Lund, Domain Leader) and Citizenship and Social, Cultural and Civic Integration (Lloyd Wong, Domain Leader). The five above-mentioned researchers argued that it was conceptually very difficult to define immigrant “integration” because it is not a unidimensional phenomenon. This position aligns with many other scholars who have argued the multidimensional trait of integration (Biles et al. 2008; Entzinger and Biezeyeld 2003; Frideres 2008). Thus integration as a multidimensional phenomenon could be measured along any one of a variety of dimensions, including economic, social, cultural, housing, communities or families. It was proposed that the variables in the Ethnic Diversity Survey (EDS) be utilized to develop specific quantitative measures of immigrant integration along dimensions pertaining to each of the substantive Domains that existed at the Prairie Metropolis Centre. The argument was made that the EDS is useful because it provides a meaningful benchmark to measure immigrant integration since it includes data on non-immigrants (Canadian-born) as well as immigrants. The notion of an immigrant integration index was central to the original proposal as a sociometric measure of the social structures and processes of integration amongst immigrants to Canada. It was argued that indexes allow for data reduction—in that a complex concept can be summarized in a single score while maintaining specific details (Babbie and Benaquisto 2002, 148). Moreover, by using multiple indicators of the concept of integration, or various dimensions thereof, there would be greater random error reduction. This would provide for greater precision in measuring immigrant integration and thus provide a valid, reliable, and simpler way of conceptualizing integration. An index would also permit a quantitative description of the process and extent of immigrant integration in Canada and be an efficient instrument for data analysis and evidenced-based research. Its value would be that it would tap the complexity of immigrant integration by capturing a full range of the various dimensions.

Historically the concern for ethnic and immigrant assimilation and integration in North America date back to the 1920s and the work of the Chicago School of Sociology and the work of Robert Park, Everett Hughes, Edward Franklin Frazier, Luis Wirth, W.I. Thomas and Florian Znanieki, to name a few. Much of the early work on immigrant assimilation and integration from the 1920s to the 1970s was

qualitative, hence it is not surprising to see in the older literature the word “index” used in a non-quantitative fashion. For example, Humphrey (1944) used the term “index of acculturation” for his qualitative analysis of how Mexican immigrant families in Detroit were adjusting in terms of the changing structure of their families and their children. Eisenstadt (1953) further discussed the notion of an index of acculturation in a theoretical and non-empirical article that summarized the literature in terms of three main interdependent indices of assimilation: a) institutional integration; b) acculturation; and c) personal adjustment and integration.

Within Canada, research on immigrant integration became a major funding focus with the establishment of the Metropolis Project in 1995 with the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and its Joint Initiatives Program. Initially there were four university-based research Centres on immigration and integration, and funding also came from a consortium of seven federal departments and agencies led by Citizenship and Immigration Canada. At the international level, Canada has recently been compared to other countries in the world in terms of state policies related to processes of integration such as the MIPEX and the Manhattan Institute’s index. Both of these comparisons are discussed in the next section.

Our work presented here is a multidimensional approach to measuring social, cultural and civic integration via a single index. After briefly reviewing some of the literature on measuring immigrant integration in some Western countries, we define integration for the Canadian context. Then we review the Canadian literature that foregrounds the variables that we decide to consider for our integration index. This is followed by a description of the methodology we use to create a social, cultural and civic integration index (SCCII). Then we apply this index to some key variables, starting off with a comparison of the integration scores of immigrants and the Canadian-born. In recent public discourse there is a concern about immigrant integration in Canada where a majority of Canadians (two-thirds) express anxiety about the social integration of new minorities (Adams 2007, 29) and, moreover, for those who feel that Canada admits too many immigrants, there are concerns about cultural integration and negative impacts on communities (Jedwab 2008a, 228). Thus an actual comparison of the social integration of immigrants compared to the Canadian-born population would be interesting in light of this discourse. However, we are cognizant of the ideological bias of benchmarking immigrants to the Canadian-born (Li 2003a, 52-55), but we begin with this comparison as it is a common one in the literature. Then we move to some comparisons related to generational status and visible minority status (herein referred to as racialized minority status).

MEASURING IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION: A BRIEF LITERATURE REVIEW

With the qualitative to quantitative shift of the notion of an index, the focus of research centered more on economic integration. In Canada there is a long history of measuring economic integration where variables such as income, employment, and occupational attainment are the indicators (Beaujot et al. 1988; Chui and Zietsma 2003; Hum and Simpson 2004; Li 2000, 2003b and this volume; Pendakur and Pendakur 2002). The measure of economic integration primarily uses single variable measures, such as income, where economic integration is achieved when the income of immigrants catches up to that of the native-born (Li 2003a, 90; 2003b). Similarly, studies of the non-economic dimensions of integration have also used single variable measures such as rates of inter-ethnic or racial marriage (Price and Zubrzycki 1962; Gordon 1964; Sung 1990; Kalbach 2002) and friendship ties (Lauer 2008). Recently, Reitz et al. (2009, chpts. 1 and 5) have measured social integration with a series of singular variables using the EDS which include: trust, life satisfaction, belonging, Canadian identity, Canadian citizenship, federal voting, and volunteering. Our work here utilizes many of these same variables but differs in that we create a singular measure of an integration index that considers many of these variables simultaneously, and we assess this integration index with a comparison of immigrants to the Canadian-born. Over the past couple of decades, a multi-dimensional approach to measuring integration has been the trend and much of this literature is European and only more recently, American and Canadian. What follows is a very brief review of the European and American cases.

In the late 1990s, scholarly work for the Council of Europe provided two landmark studies that called for multiple indicators of integration and conceptualizing integration along multiple-dimensions (Coussey and Christensen 1997; Fitzgerald 1997). More recently, a pilot study of indicators of immigrant integration for E.U. countries suggests three to four core indicators of integration for the following policy areas: 1) employment, 2) education, 3) social inclusion, and 4) active citizenship (Eurostat 2011). With the case being soundly made for multiple dimensions and multiple indicators of ethnic and immigrant integration in Europe, the focus of many recent studies has been on the application of some combination of indicators, however derived, to a specific group of countries or to single cases of specific countries, such as MIPEX (Goodman 2010; Huddleston and Niessen 2011) which considers a country's social and public policies on integration. A recent MIPEX report includes Canada, which is ranked number three out of thirty-one countries, in terms of an overall integration index score behind Sweden and Portugal (Huddleston and Niessen 2011, 11).

While MIPEX provides valuable data for comparative analysis of many countries in terms of a migrant integration policy index, many home-grown research studies have emerged over the past decade or so in specific countries to measure immigrant

integration such as Belgium (Phalet and Swyngedouw 2003), Greece (Baldwin-Edwards 2005), France (Sciences-po 2008), Netherlands (Reinsch 2001) and Israel (Malu and Rosenboim 2010). The latter two utilized sample survey data to measure integration, which is a departure from the more traditional source of government census data. The use of survey data allows for measuring more subjective dimensions of integration. Such is the case for the research reported here on Canada where the Ethnic Diversity Survey is used to measure immigrant integration comparatively.

In the United States, the inclusion of multiple indicators has been a more recent development. The Manhattan Institute's recent initiative to measure immigrant assimilation has garnered the most recent attention in the literature with three major published reports (Vigdor 2008; 2009; 2011). An *Index of Immigrant Assimilation* was created, using U.S. census data, that has three component indexes: 1) economic assimilation; 2) cultural assimilation; and 3) civic assimilation, and is used to measure the degree of similarity or dissimilarity between native- and foreign-born adults in the United States. In a recent analysis, the assimilation index is used to compare various countries in Europe and Canada wherein Canada ranked highest in overall assimilation due primarily to higher rates of naturalization than other countries. One shortcoming of the Manhattan Institute's index of immigrant assimilation is that it utilizes only behavioural and objective indicators from government census data, thus the subjective dimensions of assimilation or integration are absent. This absence of the more subjective and social psychological dimensions has been recognized by some researchers such as Choi and Madhavappallil (2009) in the U.S. whose research indicate that the attitude toward integration is important and is likely to influence the integration process. They make the case for subjective attitudinal variables along with behavioural variables to measure integration.

In summary, there is fairly extensive research that operationalizes and measures the notion of assimilation and integration in both Europe and the United States. Much of the research has attempted to examine the differences in integration or assimilation scores between immigrants and those who are native-born. Further, the variable of integration is primarily used as a dependent variable where there are efforts to determine what factors contribute to immigrant assimilation or integration. In a few rare instances, integration is considered as an independent variable that is associated with, or a factor in determining, other outcomes such as well-being and health (Sadhna and Jonnalagadda 2001) and the degree of remittances (Siegel 2007).

DEFINING INTEGRATION IN CANADA

Earlier analysis by Kymlicka, based on his assessment of Neil Bissoondath's and Richard Gwn's work, suggested that a good starting point for considering what integration means entails the following processes:

...adopting a Canadian identity rather than clinging exclusively to one's ancestral identity; participating in broader Canadian institutions rather than participating solely in ethnic-specific institutions; learning an official language rather than relying solely on one's mother tongue; having inter-ethnic friendships, or even mixed marriages, rather than socializing entirely within one's ethnic group (1998, 17-18).

This starting point clearly defined integration as more or less a one-way process for immigrants. However, Canadian scholars have generally defined integration as a two-way process whereby groups and individuals participate and interact with others at all institutional levels (Fleras 2012, 16) or, in other words, the process allows groups and individuals to become full participants in the Canadian society yet, at the same time, enabling them to retain their own cultural identity (Henry et al. 1995, 328). Simply put, integration refers to the desirable way by which newcomers should become members of the receiving society (Li 2003c, 315) and the society closely and intensely links its constituent parts, both groups and individuals (Frideres 2008, 79). Moreover, it is a two-way process involving the immigrant and host (receiving) communities (Biles et al. 2008, 272). The notion of integration in Canada is often contrasted with the notion of assimilation, a more popular concept in the United States, which scholars argue is more of a one-way process of absorption and conformity (Fleras 2010, 12), although Canadian scholars such as Li (2003c) have pointed out that Canada's discourse on immigrant integration, when analyzed critically, is actually one of conformity, compliance and uniformity.

In any event, the work here takes the above discussion as a working definition of integration in the Canadian context whereby integration is where groups and individuals have full and equitable access to, and participation in, power and privilege within major societal institutions. The view of "full" participation was promulgated by Kymlicka (1998) in his assertion that Canada's integration of immigrants was better than most other countries in the world. More recently Reitz et al. (2009, 21) suggest that the concept of social integration is multi-dimensional and includes immigrants' "...sense of belonging to and being a full participant in, society." Using the language of assimilation, integration is synonymous with secondary structural assimilation where diverse ethnic and 'racial' groups are able to participate freely at all institutional levels of the larger society (Marger 2012, 83). Moreover, institutional integration is accompanied by identificational or psychological integration and both can be measured empirically (Harles 2004). In summary, the empirical indicators for measuring immigrant integration can be divided into four dimensions, as Biles et al. (2008, 275) suggest: economic, social, cultural and political. The task here is to examine elements of the latter three to develop an integration index.

BACKGROUND LITERATURE FOR A SOCIAL, CULTURAL, AND CIVIC INTEGRATION INDEX (SCCII)

After carefully considering the general literature on immigrant integration, and potential variables in the EDS data set, we identified the following potential dimensions (and related variables) for our SCCII: 1) social and civic participation; 2) political participation; 3) belonging to Canada; and 4) experience of discrimination.

The dimension of social and civic participation includes membership and frequency of participation in societal organizations as well as volunteerism. In a recent study by Scott, Selbee and Reed (2006), conducted for the Canadian Council on Social Development, social and civic participation were measured by a very broad range of variables including membership in nonprofit and charitable community organizations, volunteering and donating, voting in elections, frequency of following news and current affairs, and informal giving. Using data from the *2000 National Survey on Giving, Volunteering, and Participating* and the *2003 General Social Survey*, the authors compared immigrants with the Canadian-born on a broad range of variables cited above. For example, they found that 30 per cent of immigrants volunteered for nonprofit or charitable organizations, which is about 5 per cent lower than the rate for Canadian-born. Many of Scott et al.'s variables are considered for the creation of the SCCII.

Further, in the late 1990s the Multiculturalism Program, as part of the Department of Canadian Heritage, held a seminar on immigrant civic participation where many scholars outlined theoretical perspectives and frameworks for thinking about and researching civic participation (Breton 1997; Frideres 1997; Helly 1997). Over the past decade, however, only a few research studies, conducted mostly by NGOs, have been published on immigrant civic participation in Canada. These include, in addition to the Canadian Council on Social Development study mentioned above, Imagine Canada (Chiasson and Morel 2007) and the Alberta Network of Immigrant Women (Ryan 2004). Earlier work by Mata (2000) examined ethnic preferences in terms of organizational involvement in Canada and, more recently, there has been work on transnationals (most of whom are immigrants) and their civic participation in societal organizations (Wong 2008). Recent work in the United States has also focused on societal organizations such as religious, sports, professional, and neighborhood organizations (Stoll and Wong 2007). The variables to be considered from the EDS to measure social and civic participation include: 1) volunteering; and 2) membership and participation in groups or organizations (art, dance or cultural groups; community organizations; ethnic or immigrant associations; hobby, social club or seniors' groups; business or job-related associations; religiously-affiliated groups; service clubs or agencies or charitable organizations; sports clubs or teams; youth organizations or children's school groups).

Political participation includes a wide range of activities from membership in political parties and politically oriented interest groups, to running for and holding official political office. A solid corpus now exists on minority representation in elected office (Andrew et al. 2008; Black and Hicks 2006a, 2006b; Black and Erickson 2006; Sayers and Jetha 2005). In a more general sense, immigrant participation in the political process has also been widely written on and these include the works of Stasiulis (1997), Saloojee (2002), Henderson (2005), Simard (2006), Howe (2007), and Gallant (2008). Recent work by Anderson and Black (2008, 59) surmises that immigrants are politically engaged although there are variations in terms of the forms or types of engagement. Unfortunately, the EDS did not include political organizations as one of the types of groups and organizations. However, voting in elections is measured and thus the three variables that measure voter participation in the last federal, provincial, and municipal elections are considered as a measure of political participation.

The notion of “belonging” to Canada has primarily been examined in terms of the recognition and accommodation of diversity (Banting et al. 2007). Structural barriers and their impact on inequality and ethnocultural community participation have been the focus of many studies over the past two decades, some of which will be discussed in the section on ‘experience of discrimination’ below. More recently, this focus has included the concept of social cohesion (Eliadis 2007; Erickson 2007; Reitz and Banerjee 2007; Soroka et al. 2007). There is also a social-psychological dimension to “belonging” and this includes one’s sense of comfort, one’s sense of trust, and one’s sense of belonging. Aside from Kazempur’s (2006) work on social trust (data from the General Social Survey) and Wong’s work (2008) on transnationals and their sense of belonging to Canada, there is very little literature that examines these social-psychological dimensions. The EDS allows for this and includes the following variables that are considered for measurement of belonging to Canada: 1) sense of comfort based on ethnicity, culture, race, skin colour, language, accent or religion; 2) sense and extensiveness of trust of people in the neighborhood, co-workers, and schoolmates; and 3) sense of belonging to municipality, province and Canada.

Finally, the experience of discrimination by immigrants and ethnic and racial minorities is a well-researched area in the Canadian literature dating back to the 1980s. More recent work focuses on racism and racial profiling in Canada (Henry and Tator 2005; Satzewich 1998; Tator and Henry 2006) and specific case studies on Muslims, Southeast Asians, and neighborhood ethnic discrimination (Beiser et al. 2001; Helly 2004; Magee et al. 2008). The EDS has very specific questions on the experience of discrimination and the following are considered: 1) experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly by others in Canada because of your ethnicity, culture, race, skin colour, language, accent or religion; 2) frequency of such discrimination over the past

five years; and 3) where this discrimination took place (on the street; store, bank, restaurant or other place of business; work or applying for job or promotion; police or courts; school or classes; neighbourhood, community or public settings; social situations, with friends or in family settings; government or public institutions).

METHODOLOGY: DATA AND INDEX CONSTRUCTION

The Data

As mentioned earlier, to develop the SCCII, we utilized data from the 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey (EDS), a post-censal survey. All individuals who had answered the long questionnaire in the 2001 Census were included in the EDS sampling frame. Between April and August of 2002, computer-assisted telephone interviewing was used to collect data on 42,476 respondents age 15 and older, living in private households in the ten Canadian provinces. Not included in the EDS were residents of Indian reserves and those who identified themselves as having Aboriginal origins or identities in the 2001 Census, as they were included in the 2001/2002 post-censal Aboriginal Peoples Survey. The EDS response rate was 75.6%. To take full advantage of the information collected through the EDS, the complete data set was accessed through the University of Calgary Research Data Center and all analyses have been conducted with person-weighted data.

Constructing the SCCII

The building of this index of integration necessitated the inclusion of multiple facets or variables in terms of their measures of “degrees of integration.” Each of these variables is germane to the notion of integration provided earlier and contributes to a partial understanding of social, cultural and civic integration, but collectively, they provide a more complete picture. The first step then was to recode the variables selected for the analysis so that they were either coded as a dummy variable or an interval variable. A categorical variable of k categories may be recoded into $(k-1)$ dummy variables. The second step was to standardize the variables so that the scale of measurement of each was not unduly overweighting the index. To standardize each variable the raw scores of each variable were converted to z -scores. The third step involved using factor analysis as a suitable function for aggregating the variables so that each variable was assigned a proper corresponding weight in the function. Thus the weights of variables were factor loadings and the factor scores were computed based on the weights and the value of each variable. Finally, the fourth step involved computing the score of the index based on the functional aggregation as defined above. Once the index was calculated, it could then be used as a new variable that allows further investigations.

Since the SCCII is a statistical tool to measure social integration, it was initially conceptualized to revolve around four core dimensions as per the background literature and definition mentioned earlier: 1) civic participation, 2) political participation, 3) sense of belonging to Canada, and 4) experience of discrimination. Initially, we identified 19 variables relevant to these four dimensions in the EDS. Appendix A provides a list of these variables, the original EDS questions, and the recoding procedures utilized. In addition, we selected these variables because they were relevant to the Citizenship and Social, Cultural and Civic Integration priority area as identified by the Metropolis project as one of the six priority areas (Metropolis Project 2007-2012).

Overall we identified five variables for the civic participation dimension, three variables for the political participation dimension, seven variables for the sense of belonging to Canada dimension, and four variables for the experience of discrimination dimension (see Appendix A).

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis determined whether the 19 variables in the four dimensions, or a portion thereof, captured the same underlying conceptual dimension which is essential to the creation of an integration index. Since the level of measurement varied across the 19 variables described above, the scores for all variables were standardized to make them comparable.¹ In order to confirm that these 19 items capture the same underlying conceptual dimension, and thus can be combined into the SCCII, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted.

In a first step, we used both the principle component factor (pcf) and iterated principal factor (ipf) method to identify clusters in our set of variables. To facilitate the interpretation of the obtained results, factor solutions were rotated using orthogonal and oblique rotations. Only variables with factor loadings larger than 0.4 were retained for further analysis. Based on the initial analysis, seven variables were excluded from the analysis. Surprisingly, respondents' degree of civic participation, participation in religious activities, and experience of discrimination did not load on any of the identified factors.

We retained eight variables, which fell into three clusters: 1) voting behaviour (voted in federal election, voted in provincial election, voted in municipal election); 2) trust (trust in neighbours, trust in colleagues); and 3) sense of belonging (sense of belonging to municipality, sense of belonging to province, sense of belonging to Canada). It is interesting to note here that of the retained variables, many are attitudinal ones and this corroborates recent work in Europe (Immigrant Integration Indicators 2007) that also supports the use of attitudinal variables albeit of the host society only. It was surprising to us that none of experience of discrimination variables were part of the cluster given the specific findings by Reitz et al. (2009, 86), who also

used the EDS, that respondents’ reported discrimination was negatively related to trust of non-family members. However, their work also shows that this tends to be the case for those immigrants who are marginalized (2009, 105). The exclusion of the variable of discrimination is also surprising because at the more societal level, perceived or actual discrimination present barriers to integration.

For the eight retained variables, the unrotated pcf solution produced three factors with an Eigenvalue larger than 1 (2.864, 2.084, and 1.239, respectively), accounting for 76.9% of the observed variance. All eight variables showed a factor loading of 0.3 or higher on the first factor. The derived scale, which includes all eight items, has a Cronbach’s alpha of .7542², which confirms that the proposed set of variables can be integrated into an index (SCCII). Table 1 summarizes the results of the factor analysis. Finally, the SCCII was created by adding all included variables and using their factor loadings as weights, which provide the relative importance of each variable in the formula. The formula is:

$$\text{SCCII} = (0.8434 \times \text{stvotefed}) + (0.8508 \times \text{stvoteprov}) + (0.8279 \times \text{stvotemun}) + (0.3838 \times \text{sttrustnei}) + (0.2248 \times \text{sttrustcol}) + (0.3999 \times \text{stsobmun}) + (0.4142 \times \text{stsobprov}) + (0.3901 \times \text{tsobcan})$$

The three variables related to “sense of belonging” need a bit further elaboration. The term “belonging” is often used in the migration literature in reference to the politics of belonging or the “politics of identity.” However, as it is used in the EDS, it

TABLE 1. Results of the Factor Analysis for the SCCII – Unrotated Solution

SCCII	Factor loading
voted in federal election	.8434
voted in provincial election	.8508
voted in municipal election	.8279
trust in neighbours	.3838
trust in colleagues	.3348
sense of belonging to municipality	.3999
sense of belonging to province	.4142
sense of belonging to Canada	.3901
Eigenvalue	2.8638
Variance explained by factor	0.3580
Cronbach’s alpha	0.7542

is more at the social-psychological level of self-identity or sense of attachment. The term “sense of belonging” in Canada was developed in the mid-1990s by policy-makers in the Canadian government shortly after the Department of Canadian Heritage was created in 1993. At this time the Government of Canada partnered with the private research firm called EKOS to create the *Rethinking Government* project. This project was part of the Department’s operating environment and included, among many others, the key research issue of social cohesion that included the variable of “sense of belonging” to Canada (Canadian Heritage 1999). In 2002, EKOS reported that approximately 80% of Canadians have a strong³ sense of belonging to Canada and that there has been little change in the proportion of Canadians who feel this way since 1994 (Jenkins 2002). The EKOS findings were corroborated by Statistics Canada’s 2003 General Social Survey (GSS) which indicated that 85% of Canadians have a strong⁴ sense of belonging to Canada (Schellenberg 2004, 17). At about the same time as the 2003 GSS, Canadian Heritage and Statistics Canada conducted the *Ethnic Diversity Survey* (EDS) in Canada that is the data set we used for the development of the SCCII.

This eight variable SCCII now provides an opportunity to measure integration and apply it to various comparison groups. In the original construction of the index, the range of index values for all variables reported in the output had a minimum value and maximum value that ranged from -9.8 to 3.9. However, for the reporting of SCCII values in the next section, they are reported as values that could hypothetically range from 0 to 12.7 as a constant of 9.8 was added to transpose the minimum and maximum values to 0 and 12.7. This makes it easier to conceptualize the index where 0 would indicate no integration and 12.7 would indicate complete integration.

FINDINGS: APPLICATION OF THE SOCIAL, CULTURAL, AND CIVIC INTEGRATION INDEX

This section examines some findings from the application of the SCCII to specific variables that are usually identified in the literature as related to the phenomenon of integration in Canada and elsewhere. Comparisons are made in this section of the SCCII scores between or among the following: 1) immigrants (foreign-born) and Canadian-born; 2) various generations (recent immigrants, earlier immigrants, second generation, and third generation; and 3) racialized minority status. Further, in some of the analysis, variations by gender are analyzed.

Nativity: Comparing Immigrants to the Canadian-Born

As indicated in the review of the literature, the traditional conceptual approach to measuring immigrant integration is to compare immigrants to the native-born as

the benchmark. The SCCII scores values are 8.98 for immigrants and 10.06 for the Canadian-born with a statistically significant difference of 1.08 (see Table 2). This result is not surprising as the expectation is that immigrants would not be as integrated compared to the Canadian-born. However, these scores do indicate that overall immigrants' degree of integration is not that different from the Canadian-born with the difference being only 1.08 in a possible continuum of scores from 0 to 12.7. This difference is small and, due to the large N, it is statistically significant. Hypothetically, the score of the Canadian-born could very well have been twice or three times that of immigrants but it is not. Further, the scores of both groups are closer to the maximum value or the higher end of the continuum. This finding indicates that the issue of immigrant integration, at least along the dimensions covered in the index, is not as serious or as significant as it is suggested in public discourse. The anxiety about immigrant integration that many Canadians have, as well as policy-makers, is inapt as these scores indicate. Further, as the gender breakdown reveals in Table 2, for both women and men the nativity differences are small but statistically significant.

TABLE 2. SCCII Score* by Nativity by Gender

Nativity	Gender		Total
	Female	Male	
Foreign-Born – Immigrant	8.93	9.03	8.98
Canadian-Born	10.18	9.94	10.06
Difference	1.25	0.91	1.08
t	23.5***	17.5***	28.9***

* Index score ranges from 0-12.7

***Significant at $p < 0.001$

Foreign Born: $n=6690$

Canadian-Born: $n=25460$

Generational Differences

Straight-line theory, as suggested in the U.S. literature (Sandberg 1974; Gans 1979), would predict that the degree of integration increases with each successive generation. While the cross-sectional data in the EDS does not allow for a direct testing of straight-line theory, it is still useful to examine generational differences and assume that later generations would also have higher SCCII scores. The data in the EDS allows for a comparison of three generations—first (immigrant), second and third—and furthermore, the first generation can be divided into recent and earlier immigrants. Overall, the SCCII scores suggests that straight-line theory appears to be the case as recent immigrants have a score of 6.63, earlier immigrants have a score of 9.92, the second generation have a score of 9.96, and the third generation have the

highest score of 10.14 (see the Total column in Table 3). Thus, as would be predicted by straight-line theory, with each subsequent generation, from recent immigrants to the third, the score values increase. Further, this trend basically holds for both women and men as well.

TABLE 3. SCCII Score* by Generation by Gender

Generational Status	Gender		Total**
	Female	Male	
Recent Immigrants (1992 to 2002)	6.63	6.63	6.63
Earlier Immigrants (1991 and before)	9.86	9.98	9.92
Second Generation	10.06	9.87	9.96
Third Generation	10.27	10.01	10.14

* Index score ranges from 0-12.7

**ANOVA indicates that there is a significant effect of generational status on the integration index scores at the $p < .001$ level for the four status levels [$F(3, 32366) = 1050.78, p = 0.0000$]. Post-hoc test for making pair-wise comparisons among means using HSD Tukey indicate statistically significant differences amongst all four means except for the difference between Earlier Immigrants (9.92) and Second Generation (9.96) at the $p < .001$ level. Recent Immigrants: $n=1890$; Earlier Immigrants: $n=4770$; Second Generation: $n=5380$; Third Generation: $n=18770$.

'Race': Comparing Racialized Minority Status

While the focus of the application of the SCCII has been on immigrants, there is the question of "Does 'race' matter?". Using the variable called "visible minority status" in the EDS allows for the comparison of racialized groups in Canada to those who are not in terms of integration. The results here clearly indicate the importance of 'race.' Overall racialized minorities have a SCCII score of 8.51 compared to 10.05 for non-racialized minorities, with the difference of 1.54 being statistically significant and also much larger than the difference between immigrants and the Canadian-

TABLE 4. SCCII Score* by Racialized Minority Status by Gender

Racialized Minority Status	Gender		Total
	Female	Male	
Racialized Minorities	8.45	8.56	8.51
Non-Racialized Minorities	10.17	9.94	10.05
Difference	1.72	1.38	1.54
t	27.75***	22.2***	35.15***

* Index score ranges from 0-12.7

***Significant at $p < 0.001$

Racialized Minorities: $n = 4,360$

Non-Racialized Minorities: $n = 27,620$

born as discussed earlier (see total column in Table 4). This relationship also holds for women and men separately with the difference between racialized minority women and non-racialized minority women being larger than it is for racialized minority men and non-racialized minority men. This difference is 1.72 compared to 1.38 and both are statistically significant.

While the SCCII score for racialized minorities is significantly different from non-racialized minorities, the category itself is not homogenous. Further analysis revealed that Filipinos have the highest SCCII score at 9.00 and Koreans have the lowest at 6.75. In between, South Asians have a score of 8.87, Chinese of 8.58 and Blacks of 8.18, to name a few. Since many of the scores amongst these selected groups are fairly close in value, a further post-hoc statistical analysis using HSD Tukey identifies which differences are significant (see Appendix B—Table 7). In summary, West Asians are significantly different from two other groups: they are less integrated than Filipinos and South Asians. Blacks are significantly different from three other racialized minority groups: they are less integrated than Filipinos and South Asians and more integrated than Koreans. Latin Americans are significantly different from four other racialized minority groups: they are less integrated than Filipinos, South Asians, and S.E. Asians, and more integrated than Koreans. Essentially Koreans are significantly less integrated than all other racialized minority groups except for West Asians where the difference is not statistically significant.

Nativity and 'Race'

When nativity is considered along with racialized minority status, racialized minorities have a lower SCCII score than non-racialized minorities within both the foreign-born (immigrant) and the Canadian-born groups (see Table 5) with the differences being statistically significant, or in other words, there is a significant effect of 'race' and nativity on the integration scores. As the analysis of variance indicates, there is a significant effect of nativity and racialized minority status on the integration index scores, at the $p < .001$ level, for the four status levels: immigrant racialized minorities, immigrant non-racialized minorities, Canadian-born racialized minorities, and Canadian-born non-racialized minorities. Further, a post-hoc test for making pairwise comparisons among means using HSD Tukey indicate statistically significant differences amongst all four means.

What is conspicuous in Table 5 is the Canadian-born racialized minority score of 8.08 which is lower than Caucasian immigrants with a score of 9.42 and even slightly lower than racialized minority immigrants with a score of 8.61. This finding further suggests that 'race' matters in terms of social, cultural and civic integration. The gap or difference in the scores between racialized minority and non-racialized minority Canadian-born of 2.05 is much larger than all the other differences discussed earlier.

This implies that there are some unique factors that are affecting the integration of the racialized Canadian-born and who are both second and third generation. This finding is corroborated in part by previous research that used different variables. For example, Reitz and Banerjee (2007, 25) found that the racialized second generation have less of a sense of belonging to Canada than their parents and that overall, there is a racial difference in the social integration of the second generation in Canada (Reitz et al. 2009, 149-150). This finding, among others in their work, led them to argue that the racialized second generation's degrees of social integration are amongst the lowest amongst youth in Canada. Other work by Jedwab (2008b, 40) indicated that second or more generation Muslims and Hindus are less likely to believe that people can be trusted compared to those who are immigrant or first generation.

TABLE 5. SCCII Score – Nativity by Racialized Minority Status

Nativity	SCCII Score*
<i>Foreign Born – Immigrant</i>	
Racialized Minorities	8.61
Non-Racialized Minorities	9.42
Difference	0.81
<i>Canadian-Born</i>	
Racialized Minorities	8.08
Non-Racialized Minorities	10.13
Difference	2.05

*ANOVA indicates that there is a significant effect of nativity and racialized minority status on the integration index scores at the $p < .001$ level for the four status levels [$F(3, 33080) = 488, p = 0.0000$]. Immigrant VM: $n=3750$; Immigrant non-VM: $n=3980$; Canadian-Born VM: $n=3620$; Canadian-Born non-VM: $n=21730$. Post-hoc test for making pair-wise comparisons among means using HSD Tukey indicate that the differences amongst all four means are statistically significant.

Generational Status and 'Race'

Given the findings above regarding nativity and 'race' with respect to SCCII scores, it follows that generational status is also likely a factor since it just further breaks down nativity into more categories. As the figures indicate in Table 6, within each generation, non-racialized minorities have higher integration scores than racialized minorities except for recent immigrants. This 'racial' factor is most noticeable for the second generation where the difference between racialized and non-racialized minorities is the largest at 2.27. The previous finding where the Canadian-born racialized minority integration score was lower than the foreign born is broken down further in Table 6. Both second and third generation racialized minorities have

TABLE 6. SCCII Score by Generation by Racialized Minority Status

Generational Status	SCCII*
<i><u>Recent Immigrants (1992 to 2002)</u></i>	
Racialized Minorities	6.69
Non-Racialized Minorities	6.48
Difference	0.21
<i><u>Earlier Immigrants (1991 and before)</u></i>	
Racialized Minorities	9.85
Non-Racialized Minorities	9.98
Difference	0.13
<i><u>Second Generation</u></i>	
Racialized Minorities	8.00
Non-Racialized Minorities	10.27
Difference	2.27
<i><u>Third Generation</u></i>	
Racialized Minorities	8.70
Non-Racialized Minorities	10.15
Difference	1.45

*ANOVA indicates that there is a significant effect of generational status and racialized minority status on the integration index scores at the $p < .001$ level for the 8 status levels [$F(7, 32175) = 527.29, p = 0.0000$]. Recent VM Immigrants: $n=1340$; Recent non-VM Immigrants: $n=590$; Earlier VM Immigrants: $n=2380$; Earlier non-VM Immigrants: $n=3370$; Second Generation VM: $n=3220$; Second Generation non-VM: $n=9260$; Third Generation VM: $n=370$; Third Generation non-VM: $n=11660$. Post-hoc test for making pair-wise comparisons among means using HSD Tukey indicate statistically significant differences amongst all means are statistically significant.

lower integration scores, 8.00 and 8.70 respectively, than earlier immigrants (both racialized and non-racialized minorities) at 9.85 and 9.98 respectively. However, their scores are higher than recent immigrants (both racialized and non-racialized minorities) with scores of 6.69 and 6.48 respectively.

Table 6a simply rearranges the previous Table 6 to make it easier to visualize generational status for both racialized and non-racialized minority groups (as two columns) and thus assess straight-line theory. For non-racialized minorities,

straight-line theory appears to hold as the SCCII score essentially increases with each subsequent generational status from a low of 6.48 to 10.15 for the third generation (which is just slightly lower than 10.27 for the second generation). In contrast, for racialized minorities, straight-line theory is not applicable and is more of a bumpy line with the highest score associated with earlier immigrants of 9.85 and second and third generation both well below that with 8.00 and 8.7 index scores respectively.

TABLE 6A. SCCII Score by Generation by Racialized Minority Status

Generational Status	Non-Racialized Minority*	Visible Minority*
Recent Immigrants (1992 to 2002)	6.48	6.69
Earlier Immigrants (1991 and before)	9.98	9.85
Second Generation	10.27	8.00
Third Generation	10.15	8.70

*ANOVA indicates that there is a significant effect of generational status and racialized minority status on the integration index scores at the $p < .001$ level for the 8 status levels [$F(7, 32175) = 527.29, p = 0.0000$]. Recent VM Immigrants: $n=1340$; Recent non-VM Immigrants: $n=590$; Earlier VM Immigrants: $n=2380$; Earlier non-VM Immigrants: $n=3370$; Second Generation VM: $n=3220$; Second Generation non-VM: $n=9260$; Third Generation VM: $n=370$; Third Generation non-VM: $n=11660$. Post-hoc test for making pair-wise comparisons among means using HSD Tukey indicate statistically significant differences amongst all means are statistically significant.

These data reinforce the importance of ‘race’ in the integration process and corroborates the finding of Reitz et al. (2009, 136-145 and 164) that race matters more for those in Canada for longer periods of time. This begs the research question of what aspects of the racialization process contribute to lower social integration amongst the second and third generation? The related factors are likely ones that are beyond just simple experiences of discrimination as the methodology of the construction of the SCCII considered this factor (see Appendix B #4).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

After considering nineteen variables for the creation of an index to measure the social, cultural, and civic integration of immigrants, eight variables remained using the statistical technique of factor analysis, and these eight constituted the SCCII. The application of the SCCII then allowed for some comparative analysis of key variables in the immigration and integration literature and allowed for a quantitative description of the process and extent of immigrant integration in Canada. The SCCII was utilized as an instrument for data analysis and evidenced-based research with the value being that of tapping the complexity of immigrant integration by capturing a range of social, cultural and civic dimensions.

First and foremost was the comparison between immigrants and the Canadian-born which is similar to much of the research conducted in the U.S. and several European countries. It should be pointed out that the Canadian-born score was not explicitly used as the normative standard. Immigrants had a lower integration score compared to the Canadian-born but the difference is small (but statistically significant due to a large N) and both scores were toward the upper end of the hypothetical range. This finding is noteworthy and suggests that the public discourse, and the concern of Canadian policy-makers, about immigrant integration being problematic may be largely overstated with respect to the social dimensions of integration. It also suggests that the issue of immigrant integration as being problematic is an overblown one in certain sectors of the Canadian media.

The findings suggest that gender is important, where women immigrants are less integrated than men and Canadian-born men are less integrated than women. In terms of generational analysis, the initial data suggests that straight-line theory appears to hold where recent immigrants are the least integrated and third generation are the most integrated. However, race matters in the integration process. The SCCII scores for racialized minorities show that they are not as integrated as non-racialized minorities and that gender is also important. For racialized minorities, women are less integrated than males and for non-racialized minorities, women are more integrated than men. When nativity is considered, there is another noteworthy finding. Non-racialized minority immigrants are more integrated than Canadian-born racialized minorities, which points directly at the critical importance of 'race' and racialization for the integration process. So, while straight-line theory basically holds for non-racialized minorities, it does not apply to racialized minorities when a generational analysis is conducted. Finally, there is some important differentiation amongst racialized minorities, as the SCCII scores show that South Asians are the most integrated and Koreans are the least integrated. Some implications of our findings for future research include work that would explain why second and third generation racialized minorities are not as integrated as earlier immigrant racialized minorities considering the fact that the experience of discrimination was not an important component of the SCCII. Finally, future research on Koreans in Canada is needed to explain their uniquely low scores on the SCCII.

APPENDIX A—LIST OF ORIGINAL VARIABLES CONSIDERED FOR SCCII AND RECODING PROCEDURES

The following constitute the original 19 variables considered for the Social, Cultural and Civic Integration Index (SCCII) and the original question in the survey along with a description of the recoding procedures. They are numbered sequentially under each of the four dimensions with the original variable labels as per the EDS codebook.

I. Civic Participation

- volunteering
- membership and participation in groups or organizations (art; dance or cultural groups; community organizations; ethnic or immigrant associations; hobby, social club or senior's groups; business or job related associations; religiously-affiliated groups; service clubs or agencies or charitable organizations; sports clubs or teams; youth organizations or children's school clubs)

Original Questions

- 1) **PC_Q020** Are you a member of, or have you taken part in the activities of, any groups or organizations at anytime in the past 12 months?
- 2) **PC_Q0401** In the past 12 months, how often did you take part in the activities of your (first group/organization) Organization?
- 3) **PC_Q0601** At any time in the past 12 months, did you volunteer your time to help with the activities of your (first group/organization) Organization?
- 4) **BK_Q130** In the past 12 months, how often did you participate in religious activities or attend religious services or meetings with other people, other than for events such as weddings and funerals?
- 5) **BK_Q135** In the past 12 months, how often did you do religious activities on your own? This may include prayer, meditation and other forms of worship taking place at home or in any other location.

Recoding Procedures

Since only respondents who are members of an organization were asked whether they participated or volunteered for the organization they are members of, two new variables had to be created to avoid missing cases. The first variable combines membership in a group or organization and frequency of participation in the activities of that group or organization, taking on a value of 0 if the respondent is not a member of a

group or organization; 1 for respondents who are members of a group or organization, but who never participate in any activities; and 2, 3, or 4 for members who participate in their group or organization's activities on a yearly, monthly, or weekly basis, respectively. Membership in a group or organization and volunteering for that group or organization were combined in a similar fashion. The newly created variable has three categories: respondent is not a member (0); respondent is a member, but does not volunteer (1); and respondent is a member and volunteers (2). The third variable pertaining to civic participation measures respondents' level of participation in religious activities in conjunction with other people. Answer categories range from "at least once a week" (1) to "not at all" (5). The fourth and final variable measures to which degree respondents engage in religious activities on their own. Again, answer categories range from "at least once a week" (1) to "not at all" (5).

II. Political Participation

- voting in elections (federal, provincial, municipal)

Original Questions

- 6) **PC_Q110** Did you vote in the last federal election?
 7) **PC_Q120** Did you vote in the last provincial election?
 8) **PC_Q130** Did you vote in the last municipal election?

Recoding Procedures

Each of the three variables was re-coded to take on a value of 1 if the respondent did answer the question with "yes," and a value of 2 if the respondent did not vote. Rather than declaring those who were not eligible to vote as missing values, we decided to retain such respondents for the analysis by assigning a value of 0 if the respondent was not eligible to vote, was not asked the question, refused to answer the question, did not recall whether he or she voted, or if the question was not applicable.

III. Sense of Belonging to Canada

- sense of comfort based on ethnicity, culture, race, skin color, language, accent, religion

Original Question

- 9) **IS_Q030** How often do you feel uncomfortable or out of place in Canada **now** because of your ethnicity, culture, race, skin colour, language, accent or religion?

- sense and extensiveness of trust in people (in the neighborhood, co-workers, school mates)

Original Questions

10) **TS_Q020** Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people?

Using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 means cannot be trusted at all and 5 means can be trusted a lot, how much do you trust each of the following groups of people...

11) **TS_Q030** People in your neighborhood

12) **TS_Q050** People you work with or go to school with

- sense of belonging to municipality, province, Canada

Original Questions

13) **AT_Q030** sense of belonging to town, city or municipality

14) **AT_Q040** sense of belonging to province

15) **AT_Q050** sense of belonging to Canada

Recoding Procedures

There was no recoding for these variables.

IV. Experience of Discrimination

- experience of discrimination or been treated unfairly by others in Canada because of ethnicity, culture, race, skin color, language, accent, religion

Original Question

16) **IS_Q100** In the past 5 years since arriving in Canada, do you feel that you have experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly by others in Canada because of your ethnicity, culture, race, skin colour, language, accent or religion?

- frequency of such discrimination over the past 5 years

Original Question

17) **IS_Q110** In the past 5 years since arriving in Canada, how often do you feel that you have experienced such discrimination or unfair treatment in Canada?

- reason for discrimination

Recoding Procedures

To avoid missing values, the two questions were combined into one variable, which takes on the value 0 if the respondent experienced discrimination “often,” 1 for respondents feeling discriminated against “sometimes,” 2 for respondents who feel “rarely” discriminated against, and 3 for respondents who stated they are “not discriminated against.”

Original Question

18) **IS_Q1201** In the past 5 years, for which reason or reason(s) do you feel that you have experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly in Canada? (first mentioned only)

Original Question

19) **IS_Q130** In the past 5 years since arriving in Canada, in which places or situations do you feel that you have experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly in Canada?

- where discrimination took place (street; store, bank, restaurant or other place of business; work or applying for a job or promotion; police or courts; school or classes; neighborhood, community or public settings; social institutions, with friends or in family settings; government or public institutions)

Recoding Procedures

The response rates for these last two questions were low so we decided against including them to avoid small-N problems later on in the analysis.

APPENDIX B — POST HOC ANALYSIS OF SCCII SCORE BY SELECTED RACIALIZED MINORITIES

TABLE 7. Differences of SCCII Scores for Selected Racialized Minorities¹

	Filipino X=9.00	Arab X=8.90	South Asian X=8.87	Chinese X=8.58	Japanese X=8.58	SE Asian X=8.33	Black X=8.18	Latin Amer. X=8.01	West Asian X=7.89	Korean X=6.75
Filipino X=9.00		0.10	0.13	0.42	0.42	0.67	0.82**	0.99**	1.11*	2.25***
Arab X=8.90			0.03	0.32	0.32	0.57	0.72	0.89	1.01	2.15***
South Asian X=8.87				0.29	0.29	0.54	0.69***	0.86**	0.98*	2.12***
Chinese X=8.58					0.00	0.25	0.40	0.57	0.69	1.83***
Japanese X=8.58						0.25	0.40	0.57	0.69	1.83***
SE Asian X=8.33							0.15	0.32**	0.44	1.58***
Black X=8.18								0.17	0.29	1.43***
Latin Amer. X=8.01									0.12	1.26**
W. Asian X=7.89										1.14
Korean X=6.75										

¹Post-hoc test for making pair-wise comparisons among means (HSD Tukey)

* significant at $p < 0.05$

** significant at $p < 0.01$

*** significant at $p < 0.001$

NOTES

1. To standardize a variable, the variable's mean is deducted from the value for each individual case. In a second step, the difference between the value for each individual case and the mean is divided by the variable's standard deviation. Values for each variable are thus rescaled, taking on a standard deviation of 1 and a mean of 0.
2. With eight items and an average inter-item correlation of .2773, the Cronbach's alpha should be around 0.76.
3. Measured as "somewhat to intense sense of belonging (5, 6, 7 on a 7-point scale).
4. Measured as "somewhat strong or very strong sense of belonging."

REFERENCES

- Adams, M. 2007. *Unlikely Utopia: The Surprising Triumph of Canadian Pluralism*. Toronto: Viking Canada.
- Anderson, C., and J. Black. 2008. The Political Integration of Newcomers, Minorities, and the Canadian-Born: Perspectives on Naturalization, Participation, and Representation. In *Immigration and Integration in Canada in the Twenty-first Century*, eds. J. Biles, M. Burstein and J. Frideres, 45-75. Montreal-Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Andrew, C., Biles, J., Siemiatycki, M. and E. Tolley, eds. 2008. *Electing a Diverse Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Babbie, E., and L. Benaquisto. 2002. *Fundamentals of Social Research*. 1st Canadian Edition. Scarborough, ON: Thomson Canada Ltd.
- Baldwin-Edwards, M. 2005. The Integration of Immigrants in Athens: Developing Indicators and Statistical Measures. http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/en/resources/detail.cfm?ID_ITEMS=18593.
- Banting, K., T. Courchene, and L. Seidle, eds. 2007. *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada*. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Beaujot, R., K. Basavarajappa, and R. Verma. 1988. *Income of Immigrants in Canada*. Cat No. 91-527. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Beiser, M., S. Noh, F. Hou, V. Kaspar, and J. Rummens. 2001. Southeast Asian Refugees' Perceptions of Racial Discrimination in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 33.1: 46-70.
- Biles, J., M. Burstein, and J. Frideres. 2008. Canadian Society: Building Inclusive Communities. In *Immigration and Integration in Canada in the Twenty-first Century*, eds. J. Biles, M. Burstein and J. Frideres, 269-278. Montreal-Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Black, J., and L. Erickson. 2006. Ethno-Racial Origins of Candidates and Electoral Performance: Evidence from Canada. *Party Politics* 12.4: 541- 561.
- Black, J., and B. Hicks. 2006a. Visible Minorities and Underrepresentation: The Views of Candidates. *Electoral Insight*, Summer. http://www.elections.ca/res/eim/article_search/article.asp?id=145&lang=e&frmPageSize=
- . 2006b. Visible Minority Candidates in the 2004 Election. *Canadian Parliamentary Review* 29: 26-31.
- Breton, R. 1997. Social Participation and Social Capital: Introductory Lecture. In *Immigrants and Civic Participation: Contemporary Policy and Research Issues*, ed. Multiculturalism Program, 4-11. Ottawa: Multiculturalism Program.
- Canadian Heritage. 1999. *Publications: Section II: Departmental Overview, Operating Environment*. http://www.pch.gc.ca/pc-ch/mindep/perf/98-99/chpr/3_e.cfm#4.
- Chiasson, N., and C. Morel. 2007. *Perceptions, Attitudes, and Motivations of New Canadians Regarding Volunteerism*. Toronto: Imagine Canada. http://www.nonprofitscan.ca/Files/kdcdc/aide_perception-sattitudes_mar19_2007.pdf.
- Choi, J. B., and T. Madhavappallil. 2009. Predictive Factors of Acculturation Attitudes and Social Support Among Asian Immigrants in the USA. *International Journal of Social Welfare* 18.1: 76-84.
- Chui, T., and D. Zietsma. 2003. Earnings of Immigrants in the 1990s. *Canadian Social Trends* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 11-008-XPE), 70 (Autumn): 24-28.

- Coussey, M., and E. Christensen. 1997. Indicators of Integration. In *Measurement and Indicators of Integration*, ed. Council of Europe, 15-22. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/migration/documentation/Series_Community_Relations/Measurement_indicators_integration_en.pdf.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. 1953. Analysis of Patterns of Immigration and Absorption of Immigrants. *Population Studies* 7.2: 167-180.
- Eliadis, P. 2007. Diversity and Equality: The Vital Connection. In *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada*, eds. K. Banting, T. Courchene, and L. Seidle, 547-561. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Entzinger, H., and R. Biezeveld. 2003. *Benchmarking in Immigrant Integration*. Rotterdam: European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations (ERCOMER)—Available at European Commission: http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/doc_centre/immigration/docs/studies/benchmarking_final_en.pdf.
- Erickson, B. 2007. Ties that Bind and Ties that Divide. In *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada*, eds. K. Banting, T. Courchene, and L. Seidle, 601-610. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Eurostat. 2011. *Indicators of Immigrant Integration. A Pilot Study—2011 Edition*. Luxembourg: European Union. <http://www.emnbelgium.be/publication/eurostat-study-indicators-immigrant-integration>.
- Fitzgerald Marian. 1997. Measurements and Indicators of Integration. In *Measurement and Indicators of Integration*, ed. Council of Europe, 56-67. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/migration/documentation/Series_Community_Relations/Measurement_indicators_integration_en.pdf.
- Fleras, A. 2010. *Unequal Relations: An Introduction to Race, Ethnic, and Aboriginal Dynamics in Canada*. 6th ed. Toronto: Pearson Canada.
- . 2012. *Unequal Relations: An Introduction to Race, Ethnic, and Aboriginal Dynamics in Canada*. 7th ed. Toronto: Pearson Canada.
- Frideres, J. 1997. Civic Participation, Awareness, Knowledge and Skills. In *Immigrants and Civic Participation: Contemporary Policy and Research Issues*, ed. Multiculturalism Program, 33-48. Ottawa: Multiculturalism Program.
- . 2008. Creating an Inclusive Society: Promoting Social Integration in Canada. In *Immigration and Integration in Canada in the Twenty-first Century*, eds. J. Biles, M. Burstein and J. Frideres, 77-101. Montreal-Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Gallant, N. 2008. Identity and Political Participation Among Young Second Generation Immigrants. *Canadian Diversity* 6.2: 47-49.
- Gans, H. 1979. Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2.1: 1-20.
- Goodman, S. W. 2010. Integration Requirements for Integration's Sake? Identifying, Categorising and Comparing Civic Integration Policies. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36.5: 753-772.
- Gordon, M. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harles, J. C. 2004. Immigrant Integration in Canada and the United States. *American Review of Canadian Studies* 34.2: 223-258.
- Helly, D. 1997. Voluntary and Social Participation by People of Immigrant Origin: Overview of Canadian Research. In *Immigrants and Civic Participation: Contemporary Policy and Research Issues*, ed. Multiculturalism Program, 68-88. Ottawa: Multiculturalism Program.
- . 2004. Are Muslims Discriminated Against in Canada Since September 2001? *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 36.1: 24-47.
- Henderson, A. 2005. Ideal Citizens? Immigrant Voting Patterns in Canadian Elections. *Canadian Issues*, Summer: 57-60.
- Henry, F., and C. Tator. 2005. *The Colour of Democracy: Racism in Canadian Society*. Toronto: Nelson Education.
- Henry, F., C. Tator, M. Winston, and T. Rees. 1995. *The Colour of Democracy: Racism In Canadian Society*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace.

- Howe, P. 2007. The Political Engagement of New Canadians: A Comparative Perspective. In *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada*, eds. K. Banting, T. Courchene, and L. Seidle, 611-646. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Huddleston, T., and J. Niessen (with E. N. Chaoimh and E. White). 2011. *Migrant Integration Policy Index III*. Brussels: Migrant Integration Policy Index, British Council and Migration Policy Group.
- Hum, D., and W. Simpson. 2004. Economic Integration of Immigrants to Canada: A Short Survey. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 13.1: 46-61.
- Humphrey, N. D. 1944. The Changing Structure of the Detroit Mexican Family: An Index of Acculturation. *American Sociological Review* 9.6: 622-626.
- Immigrant Integration Indicators. 2007. *Immigrant Integration Indicators—Proposal For Contributions to the Formulation of a System of Common Integration Indicators*. http://www.wodc.nl/images/1365_fulltext_tcm44-80242.pdf.
- Jedwab, J. 2008a. Receiving and Giving: How Does the Canadian Public Feel about Immigration and Integration? In *Immigration and Integration in Canada in the Twenty-first Century*, eds. J. Biles, M. Burstein and J. Frideres, 211-230. Montreal-Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press.
- . 2008b. Religion and Social Capital in Canada. *Canadian Diversity* 6.1: 25-46.
- Jenkins, R. 2002. EKOS Data Sources on Political Participation: Syndicated Products. Presentation at the *Bringing Worlds Together: The Study of Political Participation of Women in Canada and Lessons for Research on Newcomers and Minority Political Participation—Seminar*, Ottawa, Canada, March 22-24. http://canada.metropolis.net/EVENTS/Political%20Participation/AGENDA_e.htm.
- Kalbach, M. 2002. Ethnic Inter-marriage in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 34.2: 25-39.
- Kazempur, A. 2006. Social Trust, Ethnic Diversity, and Immigrants: The Case of Canada. *PCERII Working Paper Series* no. WP06-05. Edmonton: PCERII.
- Kymlicka, W. 1998. *Finding Our Way: Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Lauer, S. R. 2008. Immigration, Voluntary Associations, and Diverse Friendship Ties. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Sheraton Boston and the Boston Marriott Copley Place, Boston, MA. http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p242420_index.html.
- Li, P. S. 2000. Earnings Disparities between Immigrants and Native Born Canadians. *Canadian Review of Anthropology and Sociology* 37.3: 289-331.
- . 2003a. *Destination Canada: Immigration Debates and Issues*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- . 2003b. Initial Earnings and Catch-Up Capacity of Immigrants. *Canadian Public Policy* 29.3: 319-337.
- . 2003c. Deconstructing Canada's Discourse of Immigrant. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 4.2: 315-333.
- Magee, W., E. Fong, and R. Wilkes. 2008. Neighbourhood Ethnic Concentration and Discrimination. *Journal of Social Policy* 37.1: 37-62.
- Malu, M., and M. Rosenboim. 2010. *Ruppin Index of Immigrant Integration in Israel*. Emek Hefer: Ruppin Academic Center.
- Marger, M. 2012. *Race and Ethnic Relations: American and Global Perspectives*. 9th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson.
- Mata, F. 2000. Ethnic Preferences for Organizational Involvements in Canada. *Journal of the Community Development Society* 31.2: 157-172.
- Metropolis Project. 2007-2012. *Metropolis—Enhancing Policy Through Research*. http://canada.metropolis.net/policypriority/index_e.html.
- Pendakur, K., and R. Pendakur. 2002. Colour My World: Have Earnings Gaps for Canadian-Born Ethnic Minorities Changed over Time? *Canadian Public Policy* 28.4: 489-512.
- Phalet, K., and M. Swyngedouw. 2003. Measuring Immigrant Integration: The Case of Belgium. *Studi Emigrazione-Migration Studies* XL.152: 773-803.
- Price, C. A., and J. Zubrzycki. 1962. The Use of Inter-Marriage Statistics as an Index of Assimilation. *Population Studies* 16.1: 58-69.
- Reinsch, P. 2001. *Measuring Immigrant Integration—Diversity in a European City*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

- Reitz, J., and R. Banerjee. 2007. Racial Inequality, Social Cohesion and Policy Issues. In *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada*, eds. K. Banting, T. Courchene, and L. Seidle, 489-546. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Reitz, J., R. Breton, K. K. Dion, and K. L. Dion (in collaboration with M. Phan and R. Banerjee). 2009. *Multiculturalism and Social Cohesion: Potentials and Challenges of Diversity*. Springer.com: Springer.
- Ryan, J. 2004. *Immigrant and Visible Minority Women in the Non-Profit Sector as Volunteers and Paid Workers*. Calgary: Alberta Network of Immigrant Women.
- Sadhna, D., and S. Jonnalagadda. 2001. Social Integration and Health Among Asian Indian Immigrants in the United States. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work* 36.1-2: 45-62.
- Saloojee, A. 2002. Inclusion and Exclusion: A Framework of Analysis for Understanding Political Participation of Members of Racialized and Newcomer Communities. Proceedings of *Bringing Words Together Seminar Proceedings*, 34-53, Ottawa, March.
- Sandberg, N. 1974. *Ethnic Identity and Assimilation: The Polish American Community*. New York: Praeger.
- Satzewich, V. ed. 1998. *Racism and Social Inequality in Canada: Concepts, Controversies and Strategies of Resistance*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.
- Sayers, A., and I. Jetha. 2005. How Minority Politicians Build Electoral Support. *Canadian Issues*, Summer: 89-91.
- Scott, K., K. Selbee, and P. Reed. 2006. *Making Connections: Social and Civic Engagement Among Canadian Immigrants*. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development. <http://www.ccsd.ca/pubs/2006/makingconnections/>.
- Schellenberg, G. 2004. Perceptions of Canadians: A Sense of Belonging, Confidence and Trust. *Canadian Social Trends*, Statistics Canada-Catalogue No. 11-008, Winter: 16-21.
- Sciences-po. 2008. *Measuring Integration-The French Case. Regional Indices of Social and Labor Market Insertion of Third Country Nationals*. Paris: Centre d'études et de recherches internationales. http://www.ceri-sciences-po.org/cerifr/transversal/french_report.pdf.
- Siegel, M. 2007. *Immigrant Integration and Remittance Channel Choice*. Maastricht Graduate School of Governance Working Paper No. 2007/WP009. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1105668> or doi:10.2139/ssrn.1105668.
- Simard, C. 2006. The Political Involvement of New Canadians. *Electoral Insight*. http://www.elections.ca/eca/eim/article_search/article.asp?id=147&lang=e&frmPageSize=&textonly=false.
- Soroka, S., R. Johnston, and K. Banting. 2007. Ties That Bind? Social Cohesion and Diversity. In *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada*, eds. K. Banting, T. Courchene, and L. Seidle, 561-600. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Stasiulis, D. 1997. Participation by Immigrants, Ethnocultural/Visible Minorities in the Canadian Political Process. In *Immigrants and Civic Participation: Contemporary Policy and Research Issues*, ed. Multiculturalism Program, 12-29. Ottawa: Multiculturalism Program.
- Stoll, M., and J. Wong. 2007. Immigration and Civic Participation in a Multiracial and Multiethnic Context. *International Migration Review* 41.4: 880-908.
- Sung, B. L. 1990. *Chinese American Intermarriage*. New York: Center for Migration Studies.
- Tator, C., and F. Henry. 2006. *Racial Profiling in Canada: Challenging the Myth of a Few Bad Apples*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Vigdor, J. 2008. *Measuring Immigrant Assimilation in the United States* [No. 53 Civic Report]. New York: Manhattan Institute.
- . 2009. *Measuring Immigrant Assimilation in the United States*. [2nd ed., No. 59 Civic Report]. New York: Manhattan Institute.
- . 2011. *Comparing Immigrant Assimilation in North America and Europe*. [No. 64 Civic Report]. New York: Manhattan Institute.
- Wong, L. 2008. Transnationalism, Active Citizenship and Belonging in Canada. *International Journal* 63.1: 79-100.

LLOYD L. WONG is Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Calgary. His research interests include immigrant/ethnic entrepreneurship, transnationalism

and citizenship, and multiculturalism. Recent journal articles appear in *Canadian Journal of Social Research*, *International Journal*, *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, *International Migration* and the *Journal of Chinese Overseas*. Recent book chapters appear in *Sport and Migration: Borders, Boundaries and Crossings* (Macguire and Falcous eds.), *Race and Racism in 21st Century Canada* (Heir and Bolaria eds.), *Researching Amongst Elites: Challenges and Opportunities in Studying Up* (Ashgate, Schneider and Aguiar eds.) and *Mobilities, Knowledge and Social Justice* (McGill-Queens Press, Ilcan ed.).

ANNETTE TÉZLI is a PhD candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Calgary. Her dissertation research focuses on the social organization of service delivery to sheltered homeless families. Other research interests include: social inequality, poverty, modern welfare states, and qualitative research methods. Her published work has appeared in the *Canadian Journal of Sociology* and *Canadian Ethnic Studies*.