

6-2-2009

# Social Integration of Young Canadians: What Do Types of Attachment Tell Us?

Zenaida Ravanera

*The University of Western Ontario, ravanera@uwo.ca*

Rajulton Fernando

*The University of Western Ontario, fernando@uwo.ca*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/pscpapers>

---

### Recommended Citation

Ravanera, Zenaida and Fernando, Rajulton (2009) "Social Integration of Young Canadians: What Do Types of Attachment Tell Us?," *PSC Discussion Papers Series*: Vol. 23 : Iss. 5 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/pscpapers/vol23/iss5/1>

**Social Integration of Young Canadians:  
What Do Types of Attachment Tell Us?**

Discussion Paper No. 09-05

**Zenaida Ravanera and Fernando Rajulton**

Population Studies Centre, Department of Sociology

University of Western Ontario

London, Ontario N6A 5C2

Contact: ravanera@uwo.ca; Tel. 519-661-2111 ext. 85151

June 2, 2009

On the web in PDF format: <http://sociology.uwo.ca/popstudies/dp/dp09-05.pdf>

Paper presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Population Society  
Carleton University, Ottawa, May 26-29

The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official policy of the Department of Canadian Heritage. Financial contribution from the Multiculturalism and Human Rights Program is gratefully acknowledged.

Populations Studies Centre  
University of Western Ontario  
London Ontario CANADA N6A 5C2

## Introduction

Integration, a multi-dimensional concept encompassing economic, social, and political domains, differs by age and life course stages (Ravanera and Rajulton, 2006). It is influenced not only by individual and family characteristics but also by the structural and cultural contexts (Ravanera, Rajulton, and Turcotte, 2003). In this paper we focus on young Canadians, their integration into the social domain and how these are affected by various factors.

The youth stage is a period of identity formation or the process of gaining a clear and coherent sense of knowing oneself, which is also influenced by personal, social, and contextual factors (Kaspar and Noh, 2001), prominent among which are the youth's ethnic and religious background. In Canada, recent immigration patterns have increased diversity in ethnicity and religion necessitating a focus on minority groups whose process of identity formation and integration may differ from those of the majority. That is, just as the influences of economic and cultural contexts differ by age, so too could they differ by minority status, defined by ethnicity, language, or religion.

Visible and religious minorities have become a large part of the Canadian population, and their numbers will continue to grow in the coming years (Belanger and Malenfant, 2005). In the economic domain, we know that young visible minorities are doing well in terms of education, with some groups doing even better than the members of dominant group, the Whites (Abada and Tenkorang 2009; Boyd, 2008). However, the young visible minority's labour force participation and income lag behind those of the majority youth (Ravanera and Beaujot, 2009). We get a somewhat similar picture in the social domain; that is, while indicators such as sense of belonging, life satisfaction, and membership in organizations show a positive picture for minorities, the high proportion with experience of discrimination mars the positive picture (Ravanera, 2008; Ravanera and Beaujot, 2009). Underneath these two general observations are the differences among the visible minority groups. The two largest groups, Chinese and South Indians, lead the other minorities particularly in economic integration. Blacks are the most disadvantaged in the economic domain, as well as in the level of discrimination experienced.

The challenges of integration faced by the minorities could be viewed within the framework of multiculturalism in Canada, which of late has come under closer scrutiny. There are proponents on both sides of the debate. Kymlicka (2007), for example, has well enunciated the positive aspects of multiculturalism in the academic milieu, and Adams (2007) in the popular discourse. On the other hand, Joppke and Morawska (2003) propose that there is nothing in multiculturalism that is much different from policies and practices of liberal nation-states.

In this paper, as an indicator of integration in the social domain, we make use of types of attachment to society (described below as "marginalized", "separated", "assimilated", and "integrated") based on immigrant's types of acculturation strategies proposed by Berry and colleagues (Berry, 2008; Phinney et al. 2006). We examine the relationship between these types of attachment and factors that influence them such as ethno-cultural identity, religion, and generation status. To better understand the measure that we use, we first discuss the various identities that individuals could adopt, and then proceed to describe the data and the method of

measurement before discussing the results of our analysis. We conclude with a discussion of some implications of our findings for research and policies.

### **Ethnic, Cultural, and National Identities**

As will be shown in the section on data and methods below, identities based on acculturation strategies take into account two broad types of identities: ethnic identity and national identity, and both have associated cultural component that could also be referred to as cultural identity.

**Ethnic identity** is generally based on ancestry, and thus, biologically determined but is also a type of social identity that is constructed by both the individual and group, and thus situational and changeable. As Huntington (2004) notes, ethnicity and race may be inherited but they can be redefined or rejected. Ethnic boundaries are continuously negotiated by ethnic groups themselves as well as by outside observers; that is, individuals can choose from a set of identities that are generally limited to categories that are socially and politically determined (Nagel, 1994). External forces such as policies relating to immigration and policies on resource distribution and political access that are ethnically-linked could shape ethnic boundaries and influence patterns of ethnic identification (Nagel, 1994: 156-157).

While ethnic identity provides an answer to the question of “who we are”, **cultural identity** provides content and meaning to ethnicity, and is comprised of history, ideology, symbolic universe, and system of meaning; that is, it provides answers to the question of “what we are” (Nagel, 1994). More specifically, Huntington (2004:30) defines culture as referring to “people’s language, religious beliefs, social and political values, assumptions as to what is right or wrong, appropriate and inappropriate, and to the objective institutions and behavioural patterns that reflect these subjective elements.”

**National identity** is “the continuous reproduction and reinterpretation of the pattern of values, symbols, memories, myths and traditions that compose the distinctive heritage of nations and the identifications of individuals with that pattern and heritage and with its cultural elements” (Smith, 2001: 18). Smith (2001:13) also defines a nation as “a named human community occupying a homeland, and having common myths and shared history, a common public culture, a single economy and common rights and duties for all members”. A *nation* is distinguished from an *ethnic community* in that a nation’s attributes include common rights and duties for members and a single economy, which an ethnic community need not necessarily have (Smith, 2001). Further, ethnic communities need not have a common public culture – only some shared cultural elements such as language or religion; nor does it need to have standardized national history – only memory of traditions.

## Data and Methods

### The 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey

The Ethnic Diversity Survey (EDS), conducted by Statistics Canada in 2002 provides detailed information on individual and family characteristics, attitudes, and behaviours, including such topics as ethnic ancestry, ethnic identity, place of birth, visible minority status, religion, religious participation, knowledge of languages, family background, family interaction, social networks, civic participation, interaction with society, attitudes, satisfaction with life, trust and socio-economic activities (Statistics Canada, 2005).

The survey had a total of 42500 respondents, 7500 of whom were men and women aged 15-24, the subject of our study. We do analysis for all visible minorities combined, and separately for 5 groups: Non-visible minority, Chinese, South Asians, Blacks, and Other visible minority. Survey weights are used in all the statistical procedures; fractional weights are derived from assigned individual survey weights such that the number of cases equals the unweighted number for the particular group of interest.

The statistical methods used in the analysis are cross tabulations to examine bivariate relationships, and ordinal regression for a multivariate analysis of relationships. We discuss the variables used in the analysis starting with our dependent variable, the types of acculturation to society.

### Dependent Variable: Types of Attachment

In a research on immigrant youth in a number of countries Berry (2008) and Phinney and colleagues (2006) classified their respondents by the manner of acculturation based on intercultural variables including acculturation attitudes, cultural identities, language knowledge and use, and social relationships with peers. On the assumption that these variables result in attachments to either or both ethno-cultural and dominant group, in this study, we use the sense of belonging to one's ethnic group and sense of belonging to a wider society to derive types of attachment to society.

The strength of sense of belonging to one's ethnic or cultural group is a variable derived from the response to the question "Some people have a stronger sense of belonging to some things than others. Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not strong at all and 5 is very strong, how strong is your sense of belonging to your ethnic or cultural group(s)?" We considered other variables available from the survey, such as friends from the same ethnic group or importance of one's ethnicity, but preliminary analysis shows that sense of belonging is a better single indicator and has also the least number of "missing cases" or respondents who did not provide answers. In reference to the definitions discussed above, a strong sense of belonging to one's ethnic group connotes a strong identification with one's ethnic community.

Sense of belonging to the wider society is measured as a score derived from factor analysis of sense of belonging to town or city, province, Canada, and North America. This connotes

identification with the dominant group in the society; and while this is not meant as a direct individual measure of national identity, it could be considered as more closely related to *national* than to *ethnic* identity.

In deriving the types of attachment, we use the values between 1 to 3 of sense of belonging to one’s ethnic group as “weak” and 4 and 5 as “strong”, and for sense of belonging to wider society, we use a factor score of less than or equal to zero as “weak” and greater than zero as “strong”. As shown in a 2x2 table in Figure 1, four types of attachment are derived from these two variables on sense of belonging, with the more descriptive labels (in *italics*) corresponding to the types of acculturation of Berry (2008):

- *Type A* – those with weak sense of belonging to both their own ethnic group and the wider society, and corresponds to *marginalized* type;
- *Type B* – those with strong sense of belonging to their own ethnic group but with weak sense of belonging to the wider society, and could be referred to as *separated*;
- *Type C* – those with strong sense of belonging to the wider society but with weak sense of belonging to their own ethnic group, that is, they are *assimilated* into the mainstream society; and
- *Type D* – those with strong sense of belonging to both their ethnic group and the wider society, corresponding to the *integrated* type.

**Figure 1: Types of Attachment**

Sense of belonging to ethnic group	Sense of belonging to wider society	
	Weak	Strong
Weak	<b>Type A</b> (Marginalized)	<b>Type C</b> (Assimilated)
Strong	<b>Type B</b> (Separated)	<b>Type D</b> (Integrated)

These categories are used as measure of social integration with *Type A* being the least and *Type D* the most socially integrated.

### Independent Variables

The dependent variable, types of attachments, is influenced by a number of factors – demographic such as age and gender, and socio-cultural including ethnic ancestry and ethno-cultural identities, religion, generation status, family structure and social status.

#### *Age and gender*

While the paper focuses only on young Canadians aged 15-24, we have included age groups as explanatory variables as most of younger ones (aged 15-17) would still be in high school, whose attachment strategies may differ from the older ones (aged 18-24), many of whom would have gone on to post-secondary schooling and some others may have moved on to joining the labour

force. Men and women differ in the manner of social integration over the life course with women showing a stronger sense of belonging to community at younger ages and men having a stronger sense of belonging late in life (Ravanera and Rajulton 2006). Likewise, the study by Berry (2008) and colleagues shows that girls are more likely to have an integrated profile than boys.

#### *Ethno-cultural identity, race, religion and generation status*

Ethno-cultural identity, ethnic ancestry or race, and religion are the distinguishing factors between the dominant and minority groups. This is particularly true in Canada where the more recent immigrants are from countries other than Europe or the United States, and where the main religions are other than Christianity.

In the survey, respondents were asked the question: “What is your ethnic or cultural identity?” We categorized the responses to this question into: Canadian Only, Ethnic and Canadian, Ethnic Only, Regional Only, and Others. We expect that those who identify ethno-culturally as Canadian would have a *Type C* attachment (or assimilated) whereas those who identify with ethnic only would be more likely to have a *Type B* (separated) or *Type D* (integrated) attachment.

The survey also asked the question “People in Canada come from many racial or cultural groups. You may belong to more than one group on the following list. Are you ...?” The response to this question was used to derive the visible minority status, which for this analysis, we categorized into: Non-visible minority, Chinese, South Asians, Blacks, and All other visible minorities. We expect that the visible minority groups would largely be either *Type B* (separated) or *Type D* (integrated) while those are not from visible minority groups would be *Type C* (assimilated).

Religion is a cultural feature that influences one’s attachment to society. Christians, being the followers of the country’s dominant religion, are more likely to have *Type C* (assimilated) attachment than followers of other religions, which in our analysis include: Muslim, Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu, Sikh, other religions, and nor religious affiliation.

Finally, as length of stay determines the attachment to the host society, those who were born in Canada are expected to be more assimilated than immigrants. In our analysis, we used generation status categorized as first, second, and third generation to capture the length of stay in the country not only of the respondents themselves but of their ancestors as well.

#### *Family structure and socio-economic status*

As the subjects of our analysis are young people, we expect that characteristics of family of origin would have an influence on their acculturation process. We have thus included mother’s education, categorized as: high school or lower, and some post-secondary & higher, as indicator of the family’s socio-economic status. Our expectation is that, in comparison to those from lower socio-economic status, those belonging to higher socio-economic status would be aligned more to the dominant group, and thus would be more likely to have either *Type C* or *Type D* attachment (assimilated or integrated). Likewise, young people who have lived with their parents until age 15 would be less likely to be have *Type A* attachment (marginalized) as they would

have had parental support for greater attachment to either their own ethnic group or the wider society.

## Results of Analysis

In the presentation of our findings, we draw from the bivariate analysis (Table 1) of the distribution of types of attachment by the independent variables discussed above. We also discuss the results from ordinal regression (Table 2) for all groups combined. Instead of including interaction terms in our analysis, we did separate analysis for each visible minority group, the results from which are discussed whenever they significantly differ from the results of the main analysis (also shown in Table 2). An ordinal regression's positive coefficient indicates a greater likelihood of having a *Type D* (integrated) attachment; that is, strong sense of belonging to both one's ethnic group and the wider society. A negative coefficient indicates the opposite; that is, a greater likelihood of tending towards *Type A* (marginalized) attachment.

*Gender makes a difference but age does not*

Compared to young men, women are more likely to have *Type D* (integrated) attachment. As shown in Table 1, 35% of women and 27% men have *Type D* (integrated) attachment; whereas the opposite is true for *Type A* (marginalized) attachment with 37% for men and 30% for women. The gender difference remains significant even after controlling for the other variables as indicated by the positive coefficient (0.349) in Table 2.

Age does not make a difference in the modes of attachment as can be seen in Table 1 where the differences between the two age groups are not large. For example, the proportion integrated is 32% for those aged 15-17, and 30%

Demographic & Socio-Economic Variables	Types of Attachment				
	N	Type A	Type B	Type C	Type D
<b>All</b>	7860	33.6	16.8	18.8	30.8
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	4086	36.7	17.4	19.0	27.0
Female	3774	30.2	16.2	18.6	35.0
<b>Age Group</b>					
15-17	2503	31.9	17.5	18.7	31.9
18-24	5356	34.4	16.4	18.8	30.4
<b>Ethno-Cultural Identity</b>					
Canadian Only	2958	36.9	11.3	25.3	26.5
Ethnic Only	1930	25.7	20.0	15.5	38.8
Canadian & Ethnic	1195	27.5	21.1	13.6	37.8
Regional Only	983	43.3	27.6	9.7	19.4
All Others	271	39.9	9.2	22.5	28.4
<b>Visible Minority Status</b>					
Not Visible Minority	6393	36.4	14.9	20.3	28.4
Chinese	353	27.2	28.0	10.8	34.0
South Asians	277	14.1	22.4	11.9	51.6
Blacks	209	15.8	32.1	13.4	38.8
Other Vis. Minority	569	21.1	23.4	13.5	42.0
<b>Generation Status</b>					
First Generation	1136	22.3	22.5	14.7	40.5
Second Generation	1684	27.6	21.0	16.7	34.7
Third Generation	4975	38.4	14.2	20.0	27.4
<b>Religion</b>					
Christian	5346	31.8	17.3	18.5	32.3
Muslim	177	13.6	28.8	13.6	44.1
Jewish	90	26.7	23.3	11.1	38.9
Buddhist	100	25.0	25.0	8.0	42.0
Hindu	80	7.5	23.8	15.0	53.8
Sikh	100	8.0	20.0	7.0	65.0
Other religions	36	22.2	36.1	19.4	22.2
No Religious Affiliation	1834	43.9	12.6	22.6	20.9
<b>Mother's Education</b>					
High School or lower	3732	33.4	15.6	19.3	31.6
Some post-sec & higher	3869	33.5	17.8	18.6	30.1
<b>Family Structure</b>					
W/ bio. parents to age 15	6301	32.9	17.3	18.0	31.8
All other living arr.	1559	36.1	14.8	21.9	27.2

Source: 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey



for those aged 18-24. In Table 2, this small difference is seen in the non-significant coefficient of the age variable. An exception is the significant positive coefficient for Blacks indicating that the 18-24 year old Blacks are more integrated than 15-17 year olds.

Demographic & Socio-Economic Variables	All 15-24		Not Vis Min.		Chinese		South Asians		Blacks		Other Vis Min.	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
<b>All</b>												
<b>Gender: Male (r)</b>												
Female	0.349 ***		0.374 ***		0.422 ***		0.288 *		0.242		0.188	
<b>Age Group: 15-17 (r)</b>												
18-24	-0.030		-0.035		-0.153		-0.140		0.602 ***		-0.029	
<b>Ethno-Cultural Identity: Canadian Only (r)</b>												
Ethnic Only	0.173 ***		0.170 **		0.144		0.202		-0.185		0.377 **	
Canadian & Ethnic	0.209 ***		0.196 **		0.409 *		0.216		0.139		0.362 *	
Regional Only	-0.503 ***		-0.495 ***		0.358							
All Others	-0.029		0.010		0.424		2.616 ***		-1.354 ***		-0.519	
<b>Vis. Minority Status: Not Visible Minority (r)</b>												
Chinese	0.019											
South Asians	0.135											
Blacks	0.222											
Other Visible Minority Groups	0.198 *											
<b>Generation Status (Third Generation (r))</b>												
First Generation	0.228 ***		0.027		0.038		0.294		0.563		0.258 *	
Second Generation	0.143 **		0.204 ***						-0.130			
<b>Religion: Christian (r)</b>												
Muslim	0.107						0.464 *		-0.982 **		-0.101	
Jewish	0.087		0.122									
Buddhist	-0.042				0.464 *						-0.864 ***	
Hindu	0.468 *						0.678 **				0.257	
Sikh	0.999 ***						0.950 ***					
Other religions	-0.291		-0.019									
No Religious Affiliation	-0.493		-0.480 ***		-0.033		-1.920 ***		-0.914 ***		-0.859 ***	
<b>Mother's Education: High School or lower (r)</b>												
Some post-secondary & higher	-0.061		-0.036		0.181		-0.135		-0.700 ***		-0.233 *	
<b>Family Structure: Other living arrangements (r)</b>												
With biological parents to age 15	0.165 ***		0.194 ***		0.261		-1.048 ***		-0.015		0.242	
<b>Threshold</b>												
Type A (Marginalized)	-0.472 ***		-0.384 ***		-0.365		-2.216 ***		-1.900 ***		-1.056 ***	
Type B (Separated)	0.278 ***		0.270 ***		0.898 **		-0.720		-0.202		0.106	
Type C (Assimilated)	1.101 ***		1.159 ***		1.392 ***		-0.141		0.412		0.707 ***	
<b>Weighted N</b>	6940		4528		650		562		416		846	
<b>Pseudo R-Square (Nagelkerke)</b>	6.4%		4.7%		3.2%		19.1%		15.2%		6.8%	

Source: 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey

### *Minority and immigrant status are positively related to integration*

In general, minority status in terms of race, ethnicity, or religion is associated with our measure of social integration. As seen in Table 1, visible minority groups have higher proportions with *Type D* (integrated) attachment – 34% for Chinese, 52% for South Asians, 39% for Blacks, and only 28% for Whites. Whites have higher proportion with *Type C* (assimilated) attachment (at 20%) but their highest proportion is in *Type A* (marginalized) category; that is, with weak sense of belonging to both their own ethnic group and the wider society.

This is also seen in the differences by ethno-cultural identity. Of those who identify as “Canadian” only 26% have *Type D* (integrated) attachment whereas 37% have *Type A* (marginalized) attachment (see Table 1). As to be expected, those who identify as “ethnic” only or “Canadian and ethnic” have the highest proportion with *Type D* (integrated) attachment (about 38% each). Remarkable in Table 1 is the high proportion with *Type A* (marginalized) attachment

(43%) among those whose identity is “regional” only; that is, those who identified themselves as Quebecois, Acadian or with other provincial identity only.

Likewise, religion makes a difference; those belonging to non-Christian religions have higher proportion with *Type D* (integrated) attachment than the Christians. This is particularly true for Hindus with 54% and for Sikhs with 65%, a proportion that is twice as high as that of the Christians with 32% (Table 1). Though Christians and those with no religious affiliations have high proportions with *Type C* (assimilated) attachment – 18.5% and 22.6% respectively – these two groups also have the highest proportion in *Type A* (marginalized) – 32% for Christians and 44% for those with no religious affiliation.

The results of multivariate analysis (Table 2) show that the findings from the bivariate analysis hold even after controlling for other variables. The positive coefficients for “ethnic only” and “Canadian and ethnic” identity indicate that individuals in these two categories are more likely to have *Type D* (integrated) attachment than those who identify as “Canadian” only. The significant negative coefficient for those with “regional” identity signifies the greater likelihood of their having *Type A* (marginalized) attachment, a result seen in Table 1. This is evident in the highly significant coefficients in the separate regression analysis for the non visible minority, as most of those who identify with “regional” only are Whites. The coefficients for all visible minority categories are positive but not significant, which is most likely due to the visible minority status variable being correlated with the ethno-cultural identity variable.

For the religion variable, the findings in Table 1 are also seen in Table 2 showing significant positive coefficients for Hindus and Sikhs. The separate analysis for South Asians also highlights the influence of religion - compared to Christians, the Muslims, Sikhs, and Hindus have greater likelihood of having *Type D* (integrated) attachment as shown by the significant positive coefficients. In contrast, Muslim Blacks (with -0.982 coefficient) are less likely to have *Type D* attachment than Christian Blacks.

#### *Family structure matters but not socioeconomic status*

Differences in types of attachment by mother’s education, used in the analysis as indicator of family socio-economic status, are small. For example, the proportion with *Type D* (integrated) attachment are 32% for those with low educated mother and 30% for those with highly educated mothers; and the proportion with *Type A* (marginalized) are about equal (at 33%) for both categories (Table 1). The differences by types of families the young people grew up in - that is, the types of family structure - are greater: for those who lived with both biological parents until age 15, 32% have *Type D* attachment, whereas the proportion for those with other living arrangements is 27%.

When other variables are controlled for, the family structure variable still shows a significant positive coefficient whereas the coefficient for mother’s education is not significant. There are however two exceptions: for Blacks, the coefficient for mother’s education is negative and highly significant, indicating that children of Black mothers with high education are less likely to have *Type D* (integrated) attachment; and for South Asians, the coefficient for the category of

children who lived with both biological parents until age 15 is also negative and highly significant.

## Discussion

There has been much interest in the popular media about immigrants and their attachment to Canada, and research based on data gathered through the Ethnic Diversity Survey has been used in the discourse. Much has been made of the research by Reitz and Banerjee (2007). For example, Margaret Wentz (2009) in her commentary, “Can you belong to more than one nation?” refers to the finding by Reitz and Banerjee that compared to their parents, second generation of immigrant visible minority groups “feel less, not more ‘Canadian’”. This presupposes that a “Canadian” response is an indicator of national identity. However, this could be misleading as the survey question specifically asked the respondent’s *ethnic* or *cultural* identity, which as noted above, conceptually differs from *national* identity.

As Nagel (1994) notes, Whites with mixed ancestries have wider choices from which to construct ethnic identities; they are also more likely to choose a national identity (for example, “American” or “Canadian”) rather than specific ethnic identity. In contrast, visible minorities and recent immigrants have more limited choices of categories of ethnic identities. The constraint in the

**Table 3: Distribution of types of ethno-cultural identity by visible minority status and proportion (%) with "strong to very strong" sense of belonging to Canada, Canadians aged 15-24**

Ethno-Cultural Identity	All	Not Visible Minority	Visible Minority	Belonging to Canada
Canadian	40.2	45.6	17.4	80.8
Ethnic and Canadian	16.2	15.2	20.4	72.6
Ethnic Only	26.7	19.1	58.6	70.4
Regional Only	13.2	16.2	0.4	33.5
Others	3.7	3.8	3.1	73.2
Total N	7497	6064	1433	70.2

Source: 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey

choices is even more accentuated in the survey that asked the question on *ethnic ancestry* prior to the question on ethno-cultural identity. It is thus no surprise that, as can be seen in Table 3, the dominant group is more likely to mention “Canadian” as their ethno-cultural identity (46%) whereas the visible minority is more likely to identify themselves with their particular ethnic group (59%).

However, identifying oneself as a “Canadian” does not necessarily mean feeling a strong sense of belonging to Canada, just as having an ethnic identity other than Canadian does not necessarily translate to having a weak attachment to Canada. As seen in Table 3, almost 20% of those who identified themselves as “Canadian” do not have a strong sense of belonging to Canada. Likewise, of those who identify with their own ethnic group only, 70% have strong sense of belonging to Canada.

The concern over visible minorities’ attachment to Canada brought about by relying on “Canadian” identity as a measure of attachment seems unwarranted. The results from our analysis of types of attachment show that young members of visible minority groups, whether defined in terms of ethnicity, race, or religion, have as strong (if not stronger) attachment to the

wider society as the young majority White population. The higher proportion with *Type D* or “integrated” attachment among the visible minority youth is indication that strong sense of belonging to one’s ethnic or cultural group does not exclude attachment to the dominant Canadian society.

What is worth looking into more closely is the finding about those with “regional only” identity (for example, Quebecois or Acadian), who are shown in our analysis as having the highest proportion with *Type A* (marginalized) attachment; that is, with weak attachment both to their own ethnic group and the wider society. As seen in Table 3, the proportion (at 34%) with strong sense of belonging to Canada is half the proportion for those with “ethnic” identity only. This has been remarked upon in the media as well, for example, by the article by Campbell Clark (2009), based on consumer polls conducted by the Gandalf Group, which found that “the differences are sharper between Quebecers and the rest of the country than between immigrants and those born here”.

In the analysis of types of acculturation of immigrants, Berry(2008:52) states that the “integrated” immigrant youth had the best psychological and socio-cultural adaptation outcomes, with the psychological outcomes indicated by self esteem, life satisfaction, and lack of psychological problems, and the socio-cultural outcomes indicated by school adjustment and lack of behaviour problems in the community. Berry and colleagues also found that experience of discrimination is lowest among those with integrated profile.

Table 4 shows that we have similar results for psychological outcome. Among both members of the dominant majority and of the visible minority, those with *Type D* (integrated) attachment have the highest proportion very satisfied with life. However, our results for discrimination differ from Berry’s in that types of attachment have a small influence; race and ethnicity are the greatest differentiating factors. As shown in Table 4, 36% of those with *Type D* (integrated) attachment have experienced discrimination, which is about the same or slightly higher than those with *Type A* (35%) and *Type C* attachment (34%). Those with strong ethnic attachment only (that is, the *Type B* or separated) have the highest proportion of discrimination experience (43%). In contrast, the overall level of discrimination for the Whites (11%) is less than one-third of the level for the visible minority youth (38%).

**Table 4: Proportion (%) very satisfied with life, with experience of discrimination, voted in federal election, or have obtained diploma or degree Canadians aged 15-24**

	Very satisfied with life		Experienced Discrimination		Voted in Fed. Election*		Diploma/Degree or higher*	
	Total N	%	Total N	%	Total N	%	Total N	%
<b>Not Visible Minority</b>								
Total	6390	84.1	6386	10.9	3790	49.3	4359	27.6
<i>Type A</i> (Marginalized)	2328	79.6	2327	9.1	1393	47.0	1613	26.6
<i>Type B</i> (Separated)	950	83.6	951	16.5	565	53.3	651	35.3
<i>Type C</i> (Assimilated)	1296	83.2	1293	9.6	767	50.5	876	28.0
<i>Type D</i> (Integrated)	1816	90.9	1815	11.1	1065	49.5	1219	24.4
<b>Visible Minority</b>								
Total	1407	79.1	1407	37.2	680	40.6	949	26.0
<i>Type A</i> (Marginalized)	288	72.2	288	34.7	148	43.9	201	31.3
<i>Type B</i> (Separated)	361	73.4	361	42.9	172	44.2	224	27.2
<i>Type C</i> (Assimilated)	176	79.0	175	33.7	90	30.0	131	27.5
<i>Type D</i> (Integrated)	582	86.1	583	35.8	270	40.0	393	22.1

Note: \* Aged 18-24 only  
Source: 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey

While the manner of attachment to society, or social integration broadly defined, has a consequence for the well-being of individuals, integration into society could occur through the economic and political domains that may not necessarily be positively related with social integration. As can be seen in Table 4, for example, for visible minority youth, the *Type C* (assimilated) has the lowest proportion (30%) voting in the last federal election before the survey. Similarly, the *Type D* (integrated) group has the lowest proportion (22%) with post-secondary degree or higher.

Remarkably, the marginalized among the visible minority youth have the highest level of education, 31% of whom have post-secondary or higher degree (Table 4). It could be that young people intent on attaining higher education are not much concerned about belonging to either their own ethnic group or wider society. That is, young people who are economically pre-occupied or economically secure need not feel the need to be socially attached. This could be the same reason why, in our analysis, members of dominant groups defined by ethnicity (Whites, for example) or religion (Christians) have the highest proportion with *Type A* (marginalized) attachment. And the same reason for why the proportion in *Type A* is highest among the third than the second or first generation Canadians. They are secure in their attachment to the wider society and thus they could afford to not express a strong sense of belonging to either their own ethnic group or to the wider society. In contrast, immigrants or those from visible minority groups need to feel a strong belonging to an ethnic or wider community as a form of security, particularly if their economic foothold is weak.

## **Conclusion**

An underlying motivation in the analysis of attachment to society, such as what we have done, is the need to examine whether multiculturalism is an effective policy for dealing with immigrants. The policy comes under close scrutiny whenever there are concerns about integration of immigrants. As a Globe and Mail editorial (April 16, 2009) notes, “Canada is more than a job mart. Most immigrants understand that and will seize on the opportunity to belong. The problem has less to do with the expectations of new comers, than with government multiculturalism policies dating from the 1970s that tried to encourage differences.” Indeed, as our analysis showed, immigrants do feel that they belong but, contrary to the editorial’s assertion, it also showed that ethnic or cultural differences are not deterrents to belonging to Canada.

While we view multiculturalism positively, multiculturalism policies as they now stand can be improved upon. As Jebwab (2006) notes, multiculturalism itself as a policy, ideology, and practice is dynamic and subject to evaluation and adjustments. This study points to reduction of discrimination as an area where adjustments are needed, not so much in policies but more importantly, in practices. Likewise, the notion of attachment to society brings to the fore the need to enhance knowledge of and attachment to our common myths and shared history, public culture, and rights and duties, not only for immigrants but for all members of Canadian society. As the Globe and Mail’s April 16 editorial notes, “Immigrants are not the only Canadians needing a civics and history lesson”.

## References

- Abada, Teresa and Eric Tenkorang 2009. "Pursuit of University Education Among Immigrant Youth in Canada: The Roles of Parental Human Capital and Social Capital." *Journal of Youth Studies* 12( 2):185-207.
- Adams, Michael. 2007. *Unlikely Utopia: The Surprising Triumph of Canadian Pluralism*. Toronto: Viking Canada. 240 p.
- Belanger, A. and E. Caron Malenfant. 2005. Population projections of visible minority groups, Canada, provinces and regions, 2001-2017. Catalogue no. 91-541-XIE. Statistics Canada. Ottawa: Ministry of Industry. 86p.
- Berry, John W. Acculturation and Adaptation of Immigrant Youth. 2008. *Canadian Diversity* 6(2): 50-53.
- Boyd, Monica. 2008. Variations in Socioeconomic Outcomes of Second Generation Young Canadians. *Diversity* 6(2): 20-24.
- Clark, Campbell. February 3, 2009. Quebecers feel more vulnerable as minority than other Canadians. Toronto: The Globe and Mail.
- Huntington, S. P. 2004. *Who are we? :The challenges to america's identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Jebwab, Jack. 2006. Multiculturalism Issues in Canada: Thirty Five Years of Canadian Multiculturalism 1971-2006. *Diversity* 5(2): 11-12.
- Kaspar, V., & Noh, S. 2001. *Discrimination and identity: An overview of theoretical and empirical research*. Commissioned by the Department of Canadian Heritage for the Ethnocultural, Racial, Religious, and Linguistic Diversity and Identity Seminar Halifax, Nova Scotia November 1-2 2001. Pp. 1-48. Accessed on April 22, 2009 at: <http://canada.metropolis.net/events/ethnocultural/publications/discrim.doc>
- Kymlicka, W. 2007. *Multicultural Odysseys: Navigating the New International Politics of Diversity*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Joppke, Christian and Ewa Morawska. 2003. *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nagel, J. 1994. Constructing ethnicity: Creating and recreating ethnic identity and culture. *Social Problems*, 41(1), Special Issue on Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in America, 152-176.
- Phinney, Jean S., John W. Berry, Paul Vedder, and Karmela Liebkind. 2006. Pp.71-116 in Berry, John W., Jean S. Phinney, David L. Sam, and Paul Vedder (eds) *Immigrant Youth in Cultural Transition: Acculturation, Identity, and Adaptation Across National Contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ravanera, Z. 2008. Social Capital, Social Integration and Political Participation of Young Canadians. Paper presented at the 2008 European Population Conference in the session on *Integration Processes of Migrants*, Barcelona, July 9-11.

Ravanera Zenaida R. and Roderic Beaujot. 2009. Synthesis Report on Canadian Youth: A Focus on Minority Youth. Report prepared for Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

Ravanera, Z. and Rajulton, F. 2006. Social Integration over the Life Course: Influences of Individual, Family, and Community Characteristics. In K. McQuillan and Z. R. Ravanera (eds) *Canada's Changing Families: Implications for Individuals and Society*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Pp. 264-292.

Ravanera, Z., F. Rajulton and P. Turcotte. 2003. Youth Integration and Social Capital: An Analysis of the General Social Surveys on Time Use. *Youth and Society* 35(2): 158-82.

Reitz, J. and R. Banerjee. 2007. [Racial Inequality, Social Cohesion, and Policy Issues in Canada](#). In K. Banting, T. Courchene and F. L. Seidle (eds). *Belonging, Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada*. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy, 2007. Pp. 489-545.

Smith, Anthony D. 2001. *Nationalism: theory, ideology, history*. Malden, Mass.: Polity Press.

Statistics Canada. Ethnic Diversity Survey, 2002 [machine readable data file]. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada [producer and distributor] 4/13/2005 Will Kymlicka (2007)

Wente, Margaret. April 23, 2009. "Can you belong to more than one nation". Toronto: The Globe and Mail.