1

**PM-1 3 1/2" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT**

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

**Canadian Attitudes Towards Immigrants:
The Connections Between Contact, Familiarity and Positive Attitudes**

by

Andrea Michaela Levett, B.Soc.Sc.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
September 13, 1996
© copyright
1996, Andrea M. Levett

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395 rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-19438-8

Canada

Name Andrea M Levett

Dissertation Abstracts International and Masters Abstracts International are arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation or thesis. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Sociology, Ethnic and Racial Studies

SUBJECT TERM

0631 UMI

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS
Architecture 0729
Art History 0727
Cinema 0900
Dance 0728
Fine Arts 0727
Information Science 0723
Jazz 0721
Library Science 0729
Mass Communications 0728
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0409
Theater 0445

EDUCATION
General 0415
Administration 0414
Adult and Continuing 0414
Agricultural 0417
Art 0413
Blind and Multicultural 0412
Business 0408
Community College 0415
Curriculum and Instruction 0417
Early Childhood 0418
Elementary 0414
Foreign 0417
Guidance and Counseling 0419
Health 0400
Higher 0415
History of 0400
Home Economics 0418
Industrial 0421
Language and Literature 0419
Mathematics 0400
Music 0418
Philosophy of 0413
Physical 0423

Psychology 0425
Reading 0425
Religion 0427
Science 0714
Social Science 0425
Sociology of 0425
Special 0429
Teacher Training 0430
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS
Language 0419
General 0419
Ancient 0290
Classical 0290
Modern 0291
Literature 0401
General 0401
Classical 0294
Comparative 0295
Modern 0297
Ancient 0296
African 0296
American 0291
Asian 0296
Canadian (English) 0295
Canadian (French) 0295
English 0293
Germanic 0291
Latin American 0292
Middle Eastern 0295
Romance 0293
Slavic and East European 0294

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY
Philosophy 0422
Religion 0418
General 0418
Biblical Studies 0421
Clergy 0419
History of 0420
Philosophy of 0422
Theology 0449

SOCIAL SCIENCES
American Studies 0423
Anthropology 0424
Archaeology 0424
Cultural 0424
Physical 0427
Business Administration 0410
General 0410
Accounting 0422
Banking 0420
Management 0424
Marketing 0428
Canadian Studies 0428
Economics 0401
General 0401
Agricultural 0403
Commerce-Business 0406
Finance 0408
History 0409
Labor 0410
Theory 0411
Political 0408
Geography 0404
Geobotany 0401
History 0408
General 0408

Ancient 0409
Medieval 0401
Modern 0403
Black 0403
African 0401
Asian, Australia and Oceania 0403
Canadian 0404
European 0406
Latin American 0406
Middle Eastern 0403
United States 0407
History of Science 0408
Law 0408
Political Science 0415
General 0415
International Law and 0416
Public Administration 0417
Business 0414
Social Work 0402
Sociology 0404
General 0404
Criminology and Penology 0407
Demography 0409
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0401
Individual and Family 0408
Social 0408
Industrial and Labor 0409
Public and Social Welfare 0409
Social Structure and 0409
Development 0400
Theory and Methods 0404
Transportation 0409
Urban and Regional Planning 0409
Women's Studies 0403

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
Agriculture 0473
General 0473
Agriculture 0473
Animal Culture and 0473
Animal Pathology 0474
Food Science and 0473
Technology 0473
Forestry and Wildlife 0473
Plant Culture 0473
Plant Pathology 0473
Plant Physiology 0473
Range Management 0477
Wildlife Technology 0474

Earth
General 0474
Astronomy 0474
Geology 0474
Geophysics 0474
Hydrology 0474
Meteorology 0474
Oceanography 0474
Paleontology 0474
Planetary Science 0474
Soil Science 0474
Terrestrial Science 0474
Volcanology 0474
Water Resources 0474
Wildlife 0474

Earth Sciences
Astronomy 0474
Geology 0474
Geophysics 0474

Geology 0474
Geophysics 0474
Hydrology 0474
Meteorology 0474
Oceanography 0474
Paleontology 0474
Planetary Science 0474
Soil Science 0474
Terrestrial Science 0474
Volcanology 0474
Water Resources 0474
Wildlife 0474

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
Environmental Science 0468
Health Science 0468
General 0468
Agriculture 0468
Chemistry 0468
Dentistry 0468
Dietetics 0468
Hospital Management 0468
Human Development 0468
Immunology 0468
Medicine and Surgery 0468
Mental Health 0468
Nursing 0468
Nutrition 0468
Oncology and Oncology 0468
Occupational Health and 0468
Optometry 0468
Pharmacology 0468
Physiology 0468
Public Health 0468
Radiation 0468
Recreation 0468
Social Work 0468
Sports Medicine 0468
Toxicology 0468
Virology 0468
Zoology 0468

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0460
Home Economics 0460

PHYSICAL SCIENCES
Pure Sciences
Chemistry
General 0460
Agricultural 0460
Analytical 0460
Biochemistry 0460
Inorganic 0460
Nuclear 0460
Organic 0460
Pharmaceutical 0460
Physical 0460
Polymer 0460
Radiation 0460
Solid State 0460
Thermodynamics 0460
Toxicology 0460
Virology 0460
Zoology 0460
General 0460
Astronomy 0460
Astronomy and 0460
Astrophysics 0460
Atomic 0460
Electronics and Electricity 0460
Elementary Particles and 0460
High Energy 0460
Light and Sound 0460
Mechanics 0460
Nuclear 0460
Optics 0460
Physics 0460
Solid State 0460
Thermodynamics 0460
Toxicology 0460
Virology 0460
Zoology 0460
General 0460
Astronomy 0460
Astronomy and 0460
Astrophysics 0460
Atomic 0460
Electronics and Electricity 0460
Elementary Particles and 0460
High Energy 0460
Light and Sound 0460
Mechanics 0460
Nuclear 0460
Optics 0460
Physics 0460
Solid State 0460
Thermodynamics 0460
Toxicology 0460
Virology 0460
Zoology 0460

Engineering
General 0460
Agriculture 0460
Agricultural 0460
Automotive 0460
Chemical 0460
Civil 0460
Electronics and Electrical 0460
Food and Thermodynamics 0460
Industrial 0460
Marine 0460
Material Science 0460
Mechanical 0460
Metallurgy 0460
Mining 0460
Nuclear 0460
Packaging 0460
Petroleum 0460
Sanitary and Municipal 0460
System Science 0460
Thermodynamics 0460
Transportation 0460
Vibration Technology 0460
Welding Technology 0460
PSYCHOLOGY
General 0460
Agriculture 0460
Agricultural 0460
Anthropology 0460
Archaeology 0460
Art 0460
Blind and Multicultural 0460
Business 0460
Community College 0460
Curriculum and Instruction 0460
Early Childhood 0460
Elementary 0460
Foreign 0460
Guidance and Counseling 0460
Health 0460
Higher 0460
History of 0460
Home Economics 0460
Industrial 0460
Language and Literature 0460
Mathematics 0460
Music 0460
Philosophy of 0460
Physical 0460
Political 0460
Geography 0460
Geobotany 0460
History 0460
General 0460

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis

**"Canadian Attitudes Towards Immigrants: The Connections
Between Contact, Familiarity and Positive Attitudes"**

submitted by Andrea Levett, B.Soc.Sc.
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

John de Vries, Supervisor

Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University

September 20, 1996

ABSTRACT

I employ data from nine Gallup Polls conducted by the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion from 1975 to 1993 to examine trends in Canadian attitudes towards immigrants and the effects of "opportunity for contact" and "familiarity" with immigrants on attitudes towards immigrants. Specific measures are used to indicate these variables. "Opportunity for contact" is measured by living in proximity to immigrants, educational attainment and employment status, while "familiarity with immigrants" is measured by educational attainment and mother tongue. Results indicate that high levels of unemployment coupled with high levels of immigration produce negative attitudes towards immigrants. Educational attainment, mother tongue, gender and proximity to immigrants have the strongest effects on preference for raising immigration levels. These findings support the hypothesis that contact and familiarity with immigrants gives rise to favourable attitudes towards them. Other variables - income, employment status, age and marital status - did not produce meaningful effects on attitudes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to my supervisors John de Vries and Gertrud Neuwirth for all of the support and advice they have given me over the past few years. Thanks is also due to Wendy Watkins of the Social Sciences Data Archives at Carleton University for her help in acquiring the Gallup Poll data used in this study.

I would also like to thank all my family and friends who generously encouraged and supported me. I am particularly indebted to my husband Jeremy and to my mother Linda for all of their help and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
 1. INTRODUCTION	 1
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
2.1 <i>The Contact Hypothesis</i>	4
2.2 <i>Mother Tongue</i>	12
2.3 <i>Education</i>	16
2.4 <i>Income</i>	17
2.5 <i>Employment Status</i>	18
2.6 <i>Economic Circumstances</i>	18
2.7 <i>Region</i>	19
2.8 <i>Community</i>	21
2.9 <i>Changing Sources of Immigrants</i>	23
2.10 <i>Hypotheses</i>	25
 3. METHODOLOGY	 26
3.1 <i>Data</i>	26
3.2 <i>Measures</i>	26
3.2.1 <i>Attitude Towards Immigrants</i>	26
3.2.2 <i>Opportunity for Contact</i>	27
3.2.3 <i>Other Independent Variables</i>	28
3.2.4 <i>Contextual Variables</i>	29
3.3 <i>Statistical Analysis</i>	29
 4. FINDINGS	 34
4.1 <i>Long-Term Trends</i>	34
4.2 <i>Factors Influencing These Trends</i>	35
4.2.1 <i>Level of Immigration</i>	36
4.2.2 <i>Changing Immigrant Sources</i>	38
4.2.3 <i>Economic Climate</i>	39
4.3 <i>Variables Affecting Attitudes Towards Immigrants</i>	41
4.3.1 <i>The Effects of Socio-Economic Status</i>	41
4.3.2 <i>The Effects of Opportunity for Contact</i>	47
4.3.3 <i>The Effects of Mother Tongue</i>	53
4.3.4 <i>The Effects of Demographic Variables</i>	54

4.4	An Examination of the Combined Effects of Gender, Marital Status, Education and Contact with Immigrants on Attitudes Towards Immigrants	57
5	CONCLUSION	64
6	APPENDIX A - Why Canadians say they hold these views	69
7	APPENDIX B - Technical information related to the Gallup poll data	75
8	APPENDIX C - Detailed list of questions and response categories, 1975-1993	76
	C.1 <i>Attitude Towards Immigrants</i>	76
	C.2 <i>Gender</i>	76
	C.3 <i>Age Group</i>	77
	C.4 <i>Marital Status</i>	77
	C.5 <i>Mother Tongue</i>	78
	C.6 <i>Province</i>	78
	C.7 <i>Community Size</i>	79
	C.8 <i>Type of Community</i>	79
	C.9 <i>Employment Status</i>	80
	C.10 <i>Educational Attainment</i>	81
	C.11 <i>Household Income</i>	82
9	APPENDIX D - A comparison of weighted and unweighted gallup poll data, 1975-1993	83
10	APPENDIX E - An analysis of non-responses in gallup poll data: 1975-1993	87
11	APPENDIX F - Level of Canadian immigration, 1955-1993	92
12	REFERENCES	93

LIST OF TABLES

1	Percentage distribution of admitted immigrants by province of intended destination, by calendar year of landing, 1956-1991	19
2	Proportion of immigrants to the population, provinces and Canada, 1971-1991	20
3	Immigrants as a proportion of the population, for Canadian census metropolitan areas and census agglomerations of 100,000 population and over, 1971-1991, showing the overall population in 1991	22
4	Percentage distribution of country of origin among immigrants to Canada, 1968-1992	24
5	Percentage distribution of Canadian attitudes towards immigrants, "Would you be inclined to increase immigration, decrease immigration or keep the number of immigrants at about the current level?" by year	35
6	Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by educational attainment, 1975-1993	42
7	Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by household income group, 1975-1993	42
8	Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by employment status (categories indicating contact potential), 1975-1993	43
9	Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by employment status (categories indicating perceived competition), 1975-1993	43
10	The median proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by educational attainment, controlling for employment status (categories indicating perceived competition), controlling for employment status (categories indicating contact potential), and controlling for household income, Canada, 1975-1993	44
11	The median proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by employment status (categories indicating perceived competition), employment status (categories indicating contact potential), and household income, while controlling for educational attainment, Canada, 1975-1993	45

12	Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by community size, 1975-1993	47
13	Proportion of respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels in selected metropolitan areas, corresponding figures for the rest of the province, and the percentage difference, Canada, 1975-1993, and the proportion foreign born in selected metropolitan areas, corresponding figures for the rest of the province, and the percentage difference, Canada, 1991	49
14	Proportion of respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels in selected metropolitan areas, and corresponding figures for the rest of the province, 1975-1993, and the proportion foreign born in selected metropolitan areas, and corresponding figures for the rest of the province, 1991	51
15	Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels in selected Census Metropolitan Areas and corresponding figures for non-Census Metropolitan Areas, 1975-1993	53
16	Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by mother tongue by year	54
17	Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by gender, 1975-1993	55
18	Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by age, 1975-1993	55
19	Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by marital status, 1975-1993	56
20	The median proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by gender, controlling for age, 1975-1993	57
21	The median proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by gender, controlling for marital status, 1975-1993	57
22	The median proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by gender, controlling for labour force participation, 1975-1993	57

23	Percentage difference between proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by Census Metropolitan Area residence (residence in CMA versus non-CMA), gender (male versus female), mother tongue (Allophone versus Anglophone and Francophone), and education (university versus non-university), 1975-1993	58
24	The median proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by Census Metropolitan Area residence, gender, mother tongue, and education, controlling for Census Metropolitan Area residence, gender, mother tongue, and education, 1975-1993	59
25	Median proportional actual effects, adjusted actual median proportional effects, predicted additive effects, and the difference between adjusted actual and predicted additive median proportional effects, of Census Metropolitan Areas, gender, mother tongue, and education on attitudes towards immigrants, while controlling for each of the four variables	61
26	Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by influence (Allophone, university educated males living in Census Metropolitan Areas versus others), 1975-1993	63
A-1	Percentage of respondents citing each reason for increasing immigration levels, Canada, 1975, 1980	70
A-2	Percentage of respondents citing each reason for decreasing immigration levels, Canada, 1975, 1980	72
A-3	Percentage of respondents citing each reason for maintaining immigration levels, Canada, 1975, 1980	73
D-1	Computation of the index of dissimilarity for sex, for respondents 18 years and older for Canada, 1991	84
D-2	Matrix of indeces of dissimilarity for the weighted Gallup data with Statistics Canada data, 1980-1991	85
D-3	Matrix of indeces of dissimilarity for the unweighted Gallup data with Statistics Canada data, 1980-1991	85
D-4	Differences between the indexes of dissimilarity of Statistics Canada and weighted Gallup data and the indexes of dissimilarity of Statistics Canada and unweighted Gallup data, 1980-1991	86

F-1	Sum of non-responses in each Gallup poll, by year, 1975-1993	88
F-2	Income non-responses - cross-sections with non-responses of other variables in each Gallup Poll, by year, Gallup polls, 1975-1993	90
F-1	Level of Canadian immigration, 1950-1993	92

LIST OF FIGURES

1	Preferred level of immigration to Canada, by year	34
2	Immigration level and opinions on immigration level, 1968-1993	37
3	Unemployment rate and opinions on immigration level, 1970-1993	39
F-1	Immigration level by calendar year, 1955-1993	92

1. INTRODUCTION

Immigration is one issue that evokes strong feelings for many Canadians and, as such, it has been analysed for years by social scientists attempting to understand and explain its variations. Before I outline the main factors that affect attitudes towards immigrants, it is important that I first say a few words about the impact of immigration on Canadian society.

Both academics and government officials alike agree that the impact of immigration to Canada is positive. A 1991 study prepared by the Economic Council of Canada (ECC) entitled *Economic and Social Impacts of Immigration* examines the benefits of immigration and recommends raising immigration levels. The ECC finds that while the political effects, such as increasing Canada's size and power, are negligible, the social and humanitarian effects are quite significant. They suggest that the proportion of ethnic and cultural minorities in Canadian society will increase with increased levels of immigration, and, in addition to the benefits of a more culturally and ethnically diverse population, Canada will give the majority of immigrants and refugees the opportunity to improve their social, political and economic welfare by coming to Canada. The ECC also maintains that immigrants bring a small positive economic effect in terms of per-capita disposable income (1991: 131).

Li (1992) looks at the economic impact of immigration to Canada and concludes that there is a substantially higher positive economic impact than the ECC suggests. The problem with the ECC's study of economic impact, Li (1992: 147) asserts, is that it "restricted itself to examining only the effects of population size on per capita income and economic efficiency." He argues that the economic benefits for cities where immigrants are

concentrated should be assessed and not for Canada as a whole: "The reason immigration has a small impact in increasing GDP is simply because the volume of immigration (100,000) is negligible relative to the total population of 27 million" (1992: 148). Furthermore, Li (1992: 149) reminds us that immigrants contributed to Canada's postwar economic prosperity by arriving as "ready-made labour." Clearly, immigrants contribute significantly to Canadian society by making our society more ethnically diverse, and to the economy of Canada by generating larger markets.

The economic benefits of immigration are also addressed by the joint study into the economic impact of immigration by the C.D. Howe Institute and the Laurier Institute (De Voretz, 1995). They too conclude that the net economic results of immigration are positive despite diminishing returns in recent years resulting from higher proportions of family class immigrants and lower levels of independent class immigrants.

Notwithstanding these well-documented benefits, some Canadians still have doubts about the positive impacts of increased levels of immigration. Many Canadians worry about increased job competition, a larger tax burden, higher crime rates, and the deterioration of (despite its problematic definition) "cherished Canadian values" such as "equality of the sexes, respect for peace and good order, and the preservation of French in Quebec" (ECC 1991: 1-2). Many of these negative perceptions of immigrants, though not founded in reality, persist and must be understood in order to be eradicated.

Negative attitudes can stem from an ignorance of the positive contributions immigrants bring to Canada, or from outright prejudice and racism. The rhetoric of the new racism wherein a code is used to hide one's prejudice or racism such as using the term "immigrant"

to refer to visible minority Canadians is common. It would seem that immigrants are not wanted because of a perception that they cause problems, but the real reason may be that some Canadian respondents are concerned about immigrants not being "their kind," whether due to ethnic origin, religion, or simply skin colour. Thus, it remains to be determined who looks at immigration negatively and why. An analysis of Canadian attitudes can help shed some light on this problem.

In this study I analyse how and why Canadian attitudes towards immigrants have changed in recent years, and what factors affect variations in opinions. By means of a longitudinal analysis, I examine whether Canadians have become increasingly tolerant over time. In addition to examining the effects of contextual factors and individual level variables on attitudes, I focus on the link between contact and familiarity with immigrants on attitudes towards them. I use certain variables to measure "opportunity for contact" and "familiarity." Thus, I examine whether Canadians who have had the opportunity to be in contact or who are familiar with immigrants exhibit more favourable attitudes towards immigrants than do those respondents without such contact or familiarity.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 *The Contact Hypothesis*

The theory stipulating that contact with "outgroups" increases familiarity with members of those groups, eliminates stereotypes associated with them and, in turn, reduces prejudice and negative attitudes as fear of the outgroup subsides, was developed in the 1940s and 1950s in the United States (Jackman and Crane, 1986: 460). Allport (1954) proposes this "contact hypothesis" in his book *The Nature of Prejudice*:

Prejudice (unless deeply rooted in the character structure of the individual) may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional supports (ie., by law, custom, or local atmosphere), and provided it is of a sort that leads to the perception of common interests and common humanity between the members of the two groups (281).

It is believed that the absence of intergroup contact fosters ignorance of the outgroup and, in turn, encourages stereotypes, prejudice and negative attitudes.

Numerous empirical tests of the contact hypothesis were performed in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s. In each of these studies, the broad concept of contact is used in a variety of ways and in a diversity of situations. For example, Deutsch and Collins (1951) employ a concept of contact, living in proximity to blacks, to examine the relationship between interracial contact and attitudes of housewives in segregated, indicating low contact potential, and integrated, indicating high contact potential, housing projects. As well, they examine the extent to which the intimacy of the contact situation, activities such as visiting one another, shopping together, and helping each other, fosters favourable attitudes.

In a similar housing project study, Wilner, Walkley, and Cook (1952) use "degree of

proximity to blacks." a four point physical distance scale where living next door to blacks in an integrated housing project indicates the greatest opportunity for intergroup contact and living in an all-white area-segregated housing project indicates the least opportunity for intergroup contact, to measure interracial contact and examine the relationship between contact and attitudes of white women towards black residents. Like Deutsch and Collins (1951), Wilner, *et al* (1952) examine the effects of "extent of contact," ranging from "no contact" and "exchanging greetings" to "extended conversations" and "neighbourly associations," on attitudes.

In another American study, Williams (1964) explores the relationship between "intergroup contact" (opportunity for exposure to members of various ethnic groups), "intergroup interaction" (where actual communication takes place), and prejudice in American neighbourhoods, workplaces, and organizations. In each of these studies, "contact" was found to foster positive attitudes, and the greater the frequency and intimacy of the contact situation, the greater the effect on intergroup attitudes. (For earlier studies among merchant seamen and military personnel, see Brophy (1945) and Stouffer *et al* (1949).)

In his comprehensive reviews of many of these and other early empirical studies, Amir (1969, 1976) evaluates the effects of different contact situations and characteristics of individuals on attitudes towards a variety of outgroups. He reports that intergroup contact can lead to positive attitudes, particularly when certain conditions apply. Amir outlines the factors strengthening positive attitudes and reducing prejudice - all are consistent with Allport's original hypothesis. They include i) equal status contact or contact with higher

status representatives of the outgroup ii) contact of a cooperative, rather than competitive, nature, iii) intimate or personal, rather than casual, contact, and iv) contact which has institutional support, such as in law or general public agreement. Amir cautions, however, that unfavourable conditions, such as contact with lower status outgroups and competition between groups, can strengthen prejudices. He also warns that some people will never lose their prejudice, no matter how much contact they have with outgroups, as their personalities do not allow fears to subside: "Their inner insecurity and their personal disorder will not permit them to benefit from the contact with a group against whom they are prejudiced because they will always need a scapegoat" (Amir, 1969: 335). Thus, Amir concludes that, under the right conditions, intergroup contact can and will produce favourable changes in attitudes.

Unfavourable conditions surrounding the contact situation have been found to foster feelings of insecurity and, in turn, negative attitudes. Canadian scholars have used what they call the "cultural threat" thesis to explain negative intergroup attitudes in Quebec. Lambert and Curtis (1982) and White and Curtis (1990) argue that Québécois anxiety towards linguistic outgroups and towards Anglophone immigration stems from a perception that their French culture is being threatened. As well, Pettigrew (1959) and Wright (1976) cite the higher prevalence of racism in general, and support for segregationist policies in particular, among white Americans in areas where blacks are more numerous, such as in the southern United States. However, it is likely that the history of slavery and racism in the United States particularly during this time has influenced the attitudes in these findings. In fact, referring to the fact that many white Americans "appear to be more concerned about the racial

encounters they have not experienced than about those they have . . ." Wright acknowledges that "it is not just the threat of racial competition that leads to racist voting, but also the specter of or inexperienced relations between the races that appears to fuel anxieties" (1976: 214). Those who are unfamiliar with specific problems or issues will exhibit fear of what is unknown. It seems likely that the contact situation did not allow members of the two groups to interact personally or to gain a sense of familiarity with each other. As we will see next, many proponents of the contact hypothesis argue that a key to making attitude change positive is for individuals to gain a sense of familiarity with members of the outgroup.

Researchers have continued to show interest in the contact hypothesis in recent decades. This has resulted both in the proliferation of numerous laboratory and field studies designed to test the contact hypothesis and in an elaboration of the theoretical underpinnings of the hypothesis itself (see Miller and Brewer, 1984; Hewstone and Brown, 1986; Jackman and Crane, 1986; Hendrick, 1987; and Sigelman and Welch, 1993). While many of these recent studies (Cook, 1962, 1984) focus on the aforementioned "conditions" for positive attitude change in contact situations, other studies centre on the direct and indirect effects of intergroup contact. One such approach centres on the role of ignorance as a factor giving rise to prejudice and unfavourable intergroup relations. Stephan and Stephan (1986) develop a causal model of prejudice where contact has both a direct and an indirect effect on prejudice. They argue that intergroup contact is likely to reduce prejudice by reducing ignorance of and strengthening familiarity with outgroups. They explain that ignorance causes prejudice through three processes: ignorance creates anxiety about outgroups, it contributes to feelings that outgroup members are different from one's own group, and it strengthens negative

stereotypes. A reduction of ignorance can alleviate these concerns and in turn reduce prejudice by disconfirming stereotypes, by creating a sense that members of the outgroup are homogeneous individuals who are not dissimilar to individuals in the ingroup, and, in turn, by reducing fear as the degree of what is unknown about the outgroup is diminished.¹

Stephan and Stephan (1986) stress that a primary factor contributing to such ignorance is a lack of contact with outgroups. They suggest that "contact that reduces ignorance will reduce prejudice" (243). In fact, they find a significant positive relationships between contact and knowledge of another group (0.19), and between knowledge of another group and favourable attitudes towards that group (0.24), in their study of how contact among young Anglo and Chicano students in New Mexico junior-high schools contributes to knowledge of each other's culture and, in turn, liking of each other. They explain that "the more the Anglos knew about Chicano culture, the more favorable were their attitudes toward Chicanos" (Stephan and Stephan, 1984: 248). Moreover, Stephan and Stephan found that Anglo contact with Chicano school children is also significantly related (0.25) to positive attitudes towards that group irrespective of the amount of knowledge Anglos had of Chicano culture. They attribute this to Zajonc's (1968) hypothesis that "mere exposure" to objects (or outgroups) produces positive attitudes towards them. Thus, not only can contact between two ethnic groups heighten the knowledge each group has of the other's culture and, in turn, strengthen positive attitudes of each other, but contact between two groups can also directly

¹Stephan and Stephan cite several studies where cross-cultural training programs, which strengthen familiarity with outgroups, resulted in positive intergroup relations. For example, American soldiers who received cross-cultural training before leaving for their tour of duty in Korea held more positive attitudes towards host nationals than did untrained troops (1984: 235).

strengthen positive attitudes between members of those groups, simply by way of exposing each group to the other.

Several follow-up studies of the contact hypothesis illustrating the positive relationship between intergroup contact and favourable attitudes have been performed in Canada (see for example Reich and Purbhoo, 1975, and Clément *et al.*, 1977). In her study of Toronto school children's inter-ethnic attitudes and behaviours, Ziegler (1980) found that ethnically heterogeneous schools fostered inter-ethnic friendships by providing opportunities for such friendships to develop. Moreover, she found a significant positive relationship ($r = .18$, $p < .01$) between ethnic density and preference for social diversity (over preference for social homogeneity).

In another Canadian study, Kalin and Berry (1982) examine familiarity with (measured by "how well known to me" a particular group was") and attitudes towards different ethnic groups in circumscribed geographic units. They find evidence not only of a substantial positive relationship between presence of particularly non-charter ethnic groups and familiarity with those ethnic groups, but also of a significant positive relationship between presence of ethnic groups and favourable attitudes towards those ethnic groups. They too cite the contact hypothesis as the most likely explanation for their findings.

The central findings in White and Curtis's (1990) study of Anglophone and Francophone liking of each other also supports this "contact-liking pattern." They find that proximity to linguistic outgroups, measured by the proportion of outgroups in the subject's region, varies positively with attitudes towards those linguistic outgroups:

Attitudes towards English-Canadians and French-Canadians were positively influenced by the presence of the language outgroups. The increased positivity toward the language group was most marked for anglophones living in the bilingual zone in Quebec and for francophones living in bilingual areas of English Canada (457)

Thus, the contact hypothesis has been used to explore attitudes among diverse groups including "racially" and ethnically defined groups in the United States and linguistically and ethnically defined groups in Canada. Very little research has been done in Canada in the area of the contact hypothesis pertaining to racially defined groups. Much of the Canadian work focuses on the contact hypothesis among ethnic and linguistic groups. With a dramatic increase in the number of non-white immigrants entering Canada in recent decades (see discussion below), the need for research in this area is becoming more important.

In this study, I evaluate the applicability of the contact hypothesis in the case of attitudes towards immigrants in Canada. If, in general, contact with members of outgroups produces more positive attitudes towards those groups, as the contact hypothesis suggests, I would expect that contact with immigrants would foster positive attitudes towards immigrants.

In my earlier discussion of necessary conditions for positive attitude change, I had noted that prejudice could best be reduced when contact was with members of outgroups with equal or higher status, in a cooperative and personal environment which had institutional support. On the whole, in Canadian society, immigrants enjoy institutional support both in law and in public agreement. Canada's multicultural policy welcomes the diversity immigrants and ethnic groups bring to Canada, and anti-discrimination laws guarantee the rights of immigrants regardless of citizenship status. As well, prejudice and discrimination have routinely been frowned upon in recent media campaigns and in public agreement,

though privately many Canadians do hold intolerant attitudes. This support will likely work to enhance the likelihood that contact with immigrants will foster positive attitudes towards them

Contact of a competitive nature or contact with lower status outgroups will have weaker effects on attitudes towards immigrants than contact of a cooperative nature between people of equal status. Because immigrants are often perceived as creating unemployment, it is likely that during periods of economic uncertainty, both Canadians who themselves have an uncertain economic future and those with more secure positions will view immigrants and refugees as competitors for scarce jobs. Such fears, while inaccurate, are often strongly held and will likely weaken the positive effects contact has on Canadian attitudes towards immigrants (Tienhaara, 1974: 31; ECC, 1991: 1-2).

Given my earlier discussion of the positive effects of familiarity on intergroup attitudes, it would be worthwhile to also examine the whole idea of familiarity with immigrants on attitudes towards them. "Familiarity," signifying knowledge and understanding, can be gained both through contact and through other means. Familiarity acquired through contact allows negative stereotypes and unfounded fears to be eliminated and allows friendships and positive attitudes to develop and intensify. Hence, in order to ensure that familiarity is gained during the contact situation, many researchers feel the need to apply qualifying conditions, such as equal status and cooperative contact, to the contact hypothesis. Familiarity gained through first hand experience with immigrants, as well as through knowledge gained from either unbiased media reports or one's education, will likely also eliminate stereotypes and strengthen positive attitudes. I would guess that where contact

with immigrants fosters tolerant attitudes towards immigrants, it is likely that the relationship will be strengthened by factors enhancing familiarity with immigrant groups

2.2 *Mother Tongue*

In the Canadian context, *mother tongue* is related to differences in attitudes towards immigrants for a number of reasons. First of all, Allophone respondents are likely immigrants themselves or close relatives of immigrants and so will be more familiar and have more frequent contact with immigrants, than Francophone or Anglophone respondents. We have already seen that familiarity with a specific ethnic group has been shown to foster positive evaluations of that ethnic group (see Berry, 1984; Stephan and Stephan, 1986). Thus, Allophones who may be familiar with only their own immigrant or cultural group will still likely hold more favourable attitudes towards immigrants in general than English or French Canadians who may not be familiar with any immigrant group.

Secondly, some language groups may have more contact with immigrants than other language groups by reason of where they live. Allophone respondents are more numerous in those areas where immigrants tend to migrate. Thus, some may hypothesize that Allophone respondents are more likely to be in contact with immigrants than are Francophone and Anglophone respondents, independent of being more familiar with immigrants in the first place.² Similarly, Francophone and Anglophone Canadians are also unevenly distributed among the provinces where the majority of immigrants live. Thus, like

²In 1991, among Allophone Canadians, 49.3% lived in Ontario, the province in which one-quarter of all immigrants live, another 15% lived in British Columbia (where another 15.3% of all immigrants live) and 14.5% and 10.1% lived in Quebec and Alberta respectively (where almost one-fifth of immigrants live) (Statistics Canada-Catalogue No. 96-313 E, Adjusted Statistics Canada and 1991 Census data).

Allophone Canadians. English-speaking Canadians are more concentrated than French-speaking Canadians in Ontario, British Columbia, Alberta and Manitoba (Statistics Canada-Catalogue No. 96-313 E, Adjusted Statistics Canada and 1991 Census data). The uneven distribution of the language groups in areas where immigrants are concentrated will affect the differences between language groups in the relationship between contact and attitudes.

Thirdly, immigration has a different meaning for each language group in Canada. To begin with, while Canada is a bilingual country, French is the dominant language in Quebec, and English is the dominant language in the rest of Canada. This has made preserving one's language and culture of importance particularly to Francophone Quebecers and, for a number of reasons, has pushed immigration to the forefront of Francophone concerns in recent decades. The tendency for Allophone immigrants to adopt the English language in Quebec, coupled with Quebec's falling birth rate, has raised concerns about the preservation of the French language in Quebec (Behiels, 1991: 21).⁵

These issues provided an impetus for Quebec to gain control over immigration and to foster the integration of immigrants into the Francophone community. Bill 22, introduced in 1974, made French the official language in Quebec and directed those children of immigrant parents who did not already speak English to attend French language schools. These measures were strengthened with the introduction of Bill 101, the *Charter of the French Language*, in 1977. With a few exceptions, immigrants and children from other provinces were to be educated in the French language. These policies helped integrate

⁵Quebec's crude birthrate fell from 28.8 births per thousand in 1958 to 14.8 births per thousand in 1978, and down to 12.5 births per thousand in 1994 (Behiels, 1991: 21; Dumas, 1996, 104).

Allophone immigrants into French society: by the 1986-1987 school year only a third of all immigrants remained in English-language schools, down from 85 percent in the 1969-1970 school year (Behiels, 1991: 21-23). Moreover, the Couture-Cullen Agreement between Quebec and Ottawa, signed in 1978, gave Quebec a veto over non-sponsored immigration into Quebec, allowed Quebec to add its own criteria to existing Canadian requirements for selecting immigrants headed for Quebec, and gave Quebec joint control over the selection of immigrants to Quebec at overseas visa offices (Behiels, 1991: 19; Dirks, 1995: 109). These measures ensured that French speaking immigrants would be accepted in Quebec. While these initiatives likely lessened the traditional fears Francophone Quebecers have had over immigration to Quebec, English-speaking immigrants will always pose a threat to the preservation of the French language and culture in Quebec.

Unlike their French counterparts, Anglophone Canadians, at least those living outside of Quebec, have not experienced threats to their language despite the settlement in Canada of large numbers of persons with mother tongues other than English. English remains the dominant language in Canada outside of Quebec. Still, Anglophone Canadians may have anxieties about immigration for other reasons. In their study of multicultural attitudes among Québécois and English-Canadians, Lambert and Curtis (1982) argue that while Francophone Canadians are likely to oppose immigration based on linguistic considerations, Anglophone negativity towards immigrants centres on racial differences.

Moreover, while both French- and English-Canadians each constitute one community, there is no one Allophone community. Allophones can be from numerous linguistic and/or cultural communities and, as was mentioned above, may have the experience of being

immigrants or having immigrants as relatives. Immigration will again mean something different to each Allophone individual. To some Allophones, immigration will mean a way of being reunited with family and friends. Other Allophone Canadians will view immigration negatively, perhaps remembering their own harsh experiences of immigrating to Canada, and resenting the generous services available to recent immigrants.

I expect that Allophone respondents will hold the most favourable attitudes towards immigrants, firstly because they have more contact with immigrants than the other two language groups in terms of where they live, and secondly because they will likely be more familiar with immigrants as either first generation immigrants themselves or relatives of immigrants. Overall, Anglophones will likely be the next most tolerant language group after Allophones, and Francophones the least. In terms of living in proximity to immigrants, Anglophones have somewhat more of an opportunity to be in contact with immigrants than Francophones.⁴ Moreover, some Francophones, despite recent language legislation, will perceive immigrants as a threat to their language and culture, particularly if they feel that the English majority in Canada is growing as a result of immigration. Thus, given that Anglo-French relations in Quebec have been turbulent in the past, it is likely the case that, for the Québécois, the positive effects of living in proximity to immigrants on attitudes towards immigrants will be offset by the perceived threat immigrants pose to their French language and culture.

⁴Whereas over eighty-five percent of Francophone Canadians lived in Quebec in 1991, only nine percent of Canada's immigrants lived there. In contrast, almost three quarters of Anglophone Canadians lived in Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta in 1991, the same areas where over sixty percent of all immigrants lived (Statistics Canada and 1991 Census data).

2.3 Education

Higher educational attainment has been shown by a number of researchers to produce more favourable intergroup attitudes. In his analysis of social scientists' views on immigration, Moore (1986) found not only that professionals were generally more supportive of immigration than was the public, but also that economists possessed the most favourable views of the economic impact of immigration, while sociologists and anthropologists held the most favourable views of the social and cultural impacts. Guimond et al. (1989) also support this notion of the positive effects of education on intergroup attitudes. They found that regardless of field of study, favourable attitudes towards immigrants were associated with higher levels of education (Guimond et al, 1989: 202).

It is likely that attitudes towards immigrants are related to the amount of knowledge or expertise one has on the subject of immigration. We have already seen that ignorance contributes to prejudice by creating anxiety about outgroups, by contributing to the belief that outgroups are dissimilar to one's own group, and by strengthening stereotypes (Stephan and Stephan, 1984). Learning about people's values and norms and disconfirming such stereotypes and perceptions of dissimilarity can reduce prejudice and strengthen positive attitudes. While one is often not taught about intergroup similarity in the regular course of one's education, one can specialize in intergroup relations, particularly at the university level. Thus, the most likely to gain knowledge on the subject of immigration, are those who specialize in intergroup relations, such as in economics and other areas of the social sciences, often those with higher levels of educational attainment.

Higher educational attainment will foster favourable intergroup attitudes for a number of

other reasons. Firstly, since many foreign students study at universities, those proceeding to higher levels of education will likely have more contact with and opportunity to develop friendships with foreign students and immigrants than those without post-secondary schooling and less opportunity to be in contact with foreign students. Thus, in higher educational institutions, one is more likely to interact with non-white and linguistically different individuals, and, in turn, develop more favourable attitudes towards them.

As well, differences between those with lower and higher levels of educational attainment can centre on the degree to which immigrants are viewed as posing a threat to one's livelihood. The better educated have if not more stable jobs then better prospects of obtaining work, than those who are less educated. Those with less schooling are presumably more apt to face the prospect of being unemployed, and so would feel more threatened by the arrival of higher levels of immigration, than would those with post-secondary education and who do not face the threat of unemployment to such a degree.

2.4 *Income*

Like the less educated, Canadians with lower incomes will likely also hold less positive attitudes towards immigrants than Canadians with higher incomes. Canadians with lower incomes may feel that immigrants are competing with them for higher paying jobs and may blame immigrants for their own poor financial situation. This is consistent with a great body of literature acknowledging the effects of economic factors on prejudice towards immigrants and ethnic minorities. For example, in her study of post-war Gallup polls, Tienhaara (1974: 29-33) recognizes that opposition towards immigration and negative views of immigrants increased during periods of economic recession, and particularly by those who were

economically disadvantaged themselves: poorly educated, unemployed, or low income respondents.

2.5 Employment Status

Real or perceived competition associated with a particular group likely produces negative attitudes towards members of that group. Canadians who themselves have an uncertain economic future, for example, those who are unemployed, may view immigrants as competitors for scarce jobs, and, thus, hold negative attitudes towards immigrants. Those who are employed will presumably not feel threatened by the prospect of immigrants coming to Canada and will hold more positive attitudes towards immigrants.

It is also important to consider the effects of employment status on the relationship between contact with and attitudes towards immigrants. Employment status can be used to indicate potential for contact with immigrants as contact with immigrants, and outgroups in general, is likely to occur in the workplace (see Williams, 1964: 155; Jackman and Crane, 1986: 467-468). If those who are employed have more contact with immigrants than those who are not employed, employed respondents should also have more favourable attitudes towards immigrants than those who are not employed.

2.6 Economic Circumstances

At the contextual level, periods of high unemployment will likely foster negative attitudes towards immigrants, as economic insecurity will be more visible to the majority of Canadians. This may accentuate fears that immigrants contribute to poor economic times. In fact, the most common reason given by Canadians who said that they would lower immigration levels in both 1975 and 1980 was "unemployment" or "immigrants take our

jobs" (refer to Appendix A). These negative feelings may be more pronounced among those who are unemployed as they will be directly affected by the poor economic climate.

2.7 Region

Immigrants are concentrated in a number of areas in Canada including Ontario, British Columbia and to a smaller degree Alberta, Manitoba and Quebec. Respondents living in these areas will likely have a greater opportunity to be in contact with immigrants and, thus, hold more favourable attitudes towards immigrants than those living where immigrants are less concentrated, such as those from Saskatchewan and the Atlantic Provinces.

Table 1: Percentage Distribution of Admitted Immigrants by Province of Intended Destination, by Calendar Year of Landing, 1956-1991

Year	1956	1961	1971	1981	1986	1991
Newfoundland	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.3
Prince Edward Island	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1
Nova Scotia	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.1	1.1	0.7
New Brunswick	0.5	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.3
Quebec	19.0	23.6	15.8	16.4	19.6	22.4
Ontario	55.0	50.9	52.8	42.7	50.0	51.5
Manitoba	3.5	3.5	4.4	4.2	3.8	2.4
Saskatchewan	1.3	1.9	1.2	1.9	1.9	1.1
Alberta	6.0	6.7	7.1	15.0	9.8	7.4
British Columbia	10.8	10.2	15.5	17.1	12.7	13.9
Yukon & Northwest Territories	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.5*	0.1	0.1
Total in Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total in Number	164,857	71,689	121,900	128,618	99,219	230,765

* Includes 0.3% unknown.

Source: Employment and Immigration Canada, *Immigration Statistics, Annual Publication* from Jean Dumas, Report on the Demographic Situation in Canada, 1993 (Ottawa: Minister of Industry, Science and Technology, 1994): 54.

Table 1 shows the distribution of immigrants by provinces for selected calendar years. Although the percentages have varied from year to year, the actual destinations have remained remarkably common throughout the years. The province of intent for over one-half of all immigrants to Canada is Ontario. This has been the case in every year except 1981 through 1985, when the level fell to less than 43 percent (Dumas, 1994: 54). By 1986 the level was back up to over one-half of all immigrants, and has remained so up to the present day. Quebec and British Columbia have attracted moderate numbers of immigrants: between 16 and 22 percent are destined for Quebec and 10 to 17 percent to British Columbia. Immigration to the Prairies has remained low while immigration to the Atlantic region and the Territories has been minimal (Dumas 1994: 53-54).

Table 2: Proportion of Immigrants to the Population, Provinces and Canada, 1971-1991

Year	1971	1981	1986	1991
Canada	15.3	16.1	15.6	16.1
Newfoundland	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.5
Prince Edward Island	3.3	3.8	3.5	3.2
Nova Scotia	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.4
New Brunswick	3.7	4.0	3.9	3.3
Quebec	7.8	8.3	8.2	8.7
Ontario	22.2	23.7	23.1	23.7
Manitoba	15.3	14.4	13.6	12.8
Saskatchewan	12.0	8.7	7.2	5.9
Alberta	17.3	16.5	15.8	15.1
British Columbia	22.7	23.3	22.1	22.3
Total Number of Immigrants	1,955,725	3,867,160	3,908,150	4,342,890

Source: Statistics Canada, 1971, 1981, 1986 and 1991 Census.

The effect of this uneven distribution of immigrants varies according to the size of the province of destination. Table 2 shows the proportion of immigrants to the population. Both Ontario and British Columbia have almost one-quarter of their populations composed of immigrants, followed by Alberta at 15 percent and then Manitoba at 13 percent. The foreign born population of Quebec, which has been increasing, and the foreign born population of Saskatchewan, which has been decreasing, are proportionately quite small at only 9 and 6 percent respectively, while they are almost negligible in the Atlantic provinces. Thus, I would expect that attitudes would be most favourable in Ontario and British Columbia, and to a smaller degree in Alberta, Manitoba and Quebec, and the least favourable in Saskatchewan and the Atlantic Provinces.

2.8 Community

Within each province, immigrants tend to settle in major urban areas; in recent decades over half have chosen the three census metropolitan areas of Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver (McKie and Thompson 1994: 28). This has substantially increased the proportion of immigrants in a number of areas, to levels far above the Canadian average of 16 percent in 1991 (see Table 3). Toronto had the highest proportion of immigrants at 38 percent. Vancouver had the second highest at 30 percent, and Hamilton followed with 24 percent. The proportion of immigrants living in Montreal, home to the second highest concentration of immigrants (520,535 in 1991), was lower at 17 percent. Other large census areas that have proportions of immigrants that are above the national average include Ottawa, Oshawa, Kitchener, London, St. Catharines-Niagara, Windsor, Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton and Victoria. Even the larger urban areas in the Atlantic and Prairie provinces had larger

concentrations of immigrants than did their respective provinces. For example, in 1991 6.5 percent of Halifax's population was composed of immigrants, twice as many as in the rest of Nova Scotia which had 3.2 percent on average. Similarly, in 1991 St. John's had proportionately three times as many immigrants as did other areas of Newfoundland. Saskatoon and Regina had a proportion almost twice that in the rest of Saskatchewan which had on average 4.3 percent. It is likely, then, that the larger the size of the community, the greater the concentration of immigrants and the greater one's chance of being in contact with and, hence, holding positive attitudes towards immigrants.

Table 3: Immigrants as a Proportion of the Population, for Canadian Census Metropolitan Areas and Census Agglomerations of 100,000 Population and Over, 1971-1991, Showing the Overall Population in 1991

Locality	Immigrants as a Proportion of the Population				Population (Thousands)
Year	1971	1981	1986	1991	1991
Toronto	34.0	38.0	36.0	38.0	4036.3
Montreal	14.8	16.1	15.7	16.8	3213.2
Vancouver	26.5	29.6	28.4	30.1	1648.7
Ottawa	15.5	17.1	16.3	17.7	693.9
Edmonton	18.3	19.7	18.2	18.4	856.3
Calgary	20.5	21.1	20.6	20.3	768.7
Winnipeg	19.9	19.2	17.9	17.5	664.2
Quebec	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.2	663.1
Hamilton	26.7	26.1	24.1	23.5	621.8
London	20.0	20.0	18.2	18.8	395.6
St. Catharines-Niagara	22.9	22.0	20.4	18.9	378.0
Kitchener	21.8	21.9	20.7	21.5	369.5
Halifax	7.2	7.3	6.9	6.5	326.9

Locality	Immigrants as a Proportion of the Population				Population (Thousands)
Year	1971	1981	1986	1991	1991
Victoria	24.7	23.3	20.7	19.5	296.4
Windsor	21.5	21.3	20.0	20.7	271.7
Oshawa	19.9	19.4	17.2	17.2	248.9
Saskatoon	13.9	11.5	9.3	8.2	213.6
Regina	13.1	10.6	9.4	8.4	195.0
St. John's	3.0	3.2	3.1	2.8	175.4
Chicoutimi	1.4	1.1	0.8	0.7	165.0
Sudbury	12.4	10.7	10.0	8.2	163.4
Sherbrooke	3.9	4.0	3.4	3.8	142.7
Trois Rivières	1.9	1.7	1.4	1.3	139.8
Thunder Bay	21.1	16.8	15.2	13.2	129.0
Saint John	4.8	5.1	4.7	4.3	128.9

Source: Data from Statistics Canada, 1971, 1981, 1986 and 1991 Census.

2.9 Changing Sources of Immigrants

Combined with the uneven distribution of immigrants destined for each province, the fact that immigrants have increasingly been arriving from non-western countries in recent decades has resulted in the concentration of non-traditional immigrants in a number of provinces and census metropolitan areas. Corresponding with changes to the Immigration Act in 1962 and 1967, which eliminated both quotas and restrictions against non-white immigrants and the preferential treatment granted to particular groups, immigrants and refugees to Canada have increasingly come from new countries (see Table 4). Whereas in 1956, over 95 percent of immigrants came from Europe, the United States, and Australia (Leacy 1983: A385-A416), Canada's traditional sources of immigrants, by 1968 immigrants

from these latter countries constituted just over three-quarters of all immigrants coming to Canada, and by 1990 only one-quarter. In contrast, the proportion of immigrants coming from Asia, Africa, the Caribbean, and South and Central America has been increasing. In 1990, over 75 percent of all immigrants to Canada came from these latter non-traditional sources (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 1994c: 38-40; Simmons, 1990: 149).

Table 4: Percentage Distribution of Country of Origin Among Immigrants to Canada, 1968-1992

	1968	1972	1976	1980	1984	1988	1992
Europe	64.34	41.70	33.47	28.05	23.67	25.13	17.75
U.S.A.	9.32	15.79	9.64	5.75	6.72	4.04	2.98
Canada	0.57	0.92	0.61	0.41	0.47	0.00	0.00
Australia	2.27	1.36	0.95	0.86	0.50	0.32	0.33
Traditional							
Source Total	76.50	59.77	44.67	35.07	31.36	29.49	21.06
Africa	3.82	7.02	5.95	3.82	4.53	5.79	7.77
Asia	13.19	21.57	30.85	51.19	47.61	50.11	55.07
Caribbean	5.52	9.15	12.74	7.06	9.03	5.83	5.91
Latin America	0.89	2.34	5.52	2.63	7.21	7.98	9.06
Oceania	0.06	0.17	0.27	0.24	0.25	0.81	1.12
Non-Traditional							
Source Total	23.48	40.25	55.33	64.94	68.63	70.52	78.91
Grand Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Source: Allan B. Simmons, "'New Wave' Immigrants: Origins and Characteristics," in S. Halli *et al.* (Eds.), *Ethnic Demography: Canadian Immigrants, Racial and Cultural Variations*, (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1990) 149, and data from Citizenship and Immigration Canada, *Immigration Statistics, Annual Reports* (Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1968-1994).

While the majority of immigrants living in the Prairie (excluding Alberta) and Atlantic Provinces are "older" immigrants who came to Canada before 1946 (Burnet, 1981: 21), the majority of immigrants living in Ontario, British Columbia, Alberta and Quebec arrived since the Second World War. The visibility of these new immigrants will then be more apparent to those living in these latter areas. As contact with these new streams of

immigrants increases, attitudes towards immigrants will likely become more positive.

2.10 Hypotheses

I hypothesize that

- i) contact with immigrants, whether through living in proximity to immigrants, by meeting immigrants in the workforce, or meeting immigrants at higher levels of education, will foster positive attitudes towards immigrants by the majority of Canadians as the contact hypothesis suggests; and
- ii) factors enhancing familiarity with immigrants, such as high educational attainment and close association with immigrants, will likely strengthen the positive effects of contact; and
- iii) periods of high unemployment will weaken the effects of contact. As well,
- iv) those who feel threatened by immigrants or feel that they must compete with immigrants for scarce jobs, those with lower incomes and the unemployed, will have more negative attitudes than those who do not perceive immigrants as competitors, those with higher incomes and those with employment; and
- v) attitudes towards immigrants will be most negative among Francophone Quebecers, as they are more likely than the other two language groups to perceive immigrants as a threat to their language and culture.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Data

In this study, I analyse Gallup Polls conducted by the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion (CIPO) between 1975 and 1993. The data were collected through face-to-face interviews (1975 through 1990) and by telephone survey (1991 and 1993) using a modified probability sample of non-institutionalized Canadian adults (excluding those in Labrador, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories). The sample size ranged from 1000 to 1067 respondents; the average number of respondents was 1039. The Carleton University Social Science Data Archives provided the data, while I performed the analysis and interpretation of the data.^a

Contextual factors, including the level of immigration, changing sources of immigration, and the economic climate are used to examine the longitudinal patterns of Canadian attitudes. The analysis then explores both the separate and combined effects of a number of factors on attitudes towards immigrants: proximity to immigrants, mother tongue, educational attainment, household income, employment status, age, gender and marital status.

3.2 Measures^b

3.2.1 *Attitude Towards Immigrants*

Attitude towards immigrants is measured by the question "If it were your job to plan an immigration policy for Canada at this time, would you be inclined to increase immigration, decrease immigration or keep the number of immigrants at about the current level?" The four response options are "increase," "same level," "decrease," and "don't know," where

^aFor a complete description of the method of data collection refer to Appendix B.

^bFor a detailed list of questions and response categories refer to Appendix C.

"increase" indicates the most positive response, "decrease" the most negative response and "same level" indicating the mid-range attitude towards immigrants. This question was chosen, because the same question was contained in nine surveys over nineteen years: June 1975, September 1980, November 1982, March 1987, March 1988, August 1989, September 1990, June 1991 and December 1993.⁷

3.2.2 *Opportunity for Contact*

The concept of contact, as indicated above, is used in many different senses, encompassing many varied situations and behaviours. While no direct question is available to measure whether contact has actually taken place, we can infer "contact opportunity." Hence, for purposes of this study, "opportunity for contact with immigrants" signifies seeing, meeting, or communicating with immigrants. Many researchers have shown that the higher the proportion of outgroups in a locality, the greater the opportunity for contact between groups (White and Curtis, 1990; Jackman and Crane, 1986; Kalin and Berry, 1982; and Ziegler, 1980). Thus, the independent variable *opportunity for contact* is measured by living in proximity to immigrants, a function of the proportion of immigrants in a geographically prescribed area. I examine attitudes towards immigrants in several communities (Halifax, Montreal/Quebec City, Toronto/Ottawa/Hamilton, Winnipeg, Saskatoon/Regina, Edmonton/Calgary, and Vancouver) and compare these to the attitudes of people living in the remainder of the province ("Nova Scotia excluding Halifax," "Quebec excluding Montreal and Quebec City," "Ontario excluding Toronto, Ottawa and Hamilton," "Manitoba

⁷This question was asked a tenth time in 1985. However, the data file was never transferred to the Carleton University Social Science Data Archives and as a result was not included in this study.

excluding Winnipeg," "Saskatchewan excluding Saskatoon and Regina," "Alberta excluding Edmonton and Calgary," and "British Columbia excluding Vancouver"). Data on the composition of these areas indicate the proportion of foreign born residents in the population from the 1971, 1976, 1981, 1986 and 1991 Censuses.

3.2.3 Other Independent Variables

As well as using "proximity to immigrants" as a measure for contact opportunity, two other variables are employed as proxies for "contact potential": educational attainment and employment status. As was discussed in the previous chapter, "*Educational Attainment*," coded as "high school education or less," "college education," and "university education," can signify both *contact potential* and *familiarity* with immigrants. "*Employment Status*" is composed of three categories: "working full-time"; "working part-time"; "not working at all". I regroup employment status in two ways: firstly, to measure *contact potential*: "not employed" indicates little potential for contact with immigrants; "employed part- or full-time" indicates high potential for contact with immigrants; and secondly, to measure *perceived competition*: "working less than full-time" indicates potential for competition; "working full-time" indicates no competition.

Household Income is grouped into "lower income group" (the lower one-third of respondents); "middle income group" (the middle one-third of respondents); "upper income group" (the upper one-third of respondents),⁸ and like employment status signifies *perceived*

⁸The Gallup data on household income were not adjusted for the inflation rate. In order to compare the effects of the income variable on attitudes towards immigrants between the nine samples, I regrouped Gallup's household income categories (refer to Appendix C for a detailed list of the categories used) into three comparable categories for each of the nine years examined: a bottom third, a middle third and an upper third of respondents.

competition: "low income" indicates potential for competition while "middle" and "upper income" indicates no such potential for competition. **Mother Tongue**, coded as "English," "French," and "Other," is used as a proxy for *familiarity* with immigrants, where Allophone indicates familiarity, as well as for *perceived threat* to one's language and culture in the case of Francophones. **Gender** is coded as "male"; "female"; **Age** is coded as "18 to 29 years"; "30 to 49 years"; and "50 years and over"; and **Marital Status** is coded as "single"; "married"; "widowed, divorced, or separated"; "living as married".

3.2.4 Contextual Variables

Data on the **Rate of Unemployment** are based on Statistics Canada figures (Statistics Canada Cat. No. 71-201, 1987: 195, 1995: 218). Data on the **level and sources of immigration** are based on annual reports published by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (Cat. No. MP22-1/1968-1992).

3.3 Statistical Analysis

The use of tests of significance is only appropriate in certain circumstances, such as when probabilistic sampling procedures are employed. Jackson (1988) explains: "Since tests of significance only provide a measure of the probability of a given difference being the result of sampling fluctuations, assuming probability sampling procedures, such tests are not appropriate if those methods are not used" (155). While CIPO did use probabilistic sampling to select its urban sample, it employed quota sampling based on sex and age in rural areas. Because CIPO's sample is not entirely probabilistic, I have chosen to omit the use of statistical tests of significance in my analysis.

Instead, to determine which findings are substantially relevant, I use the size of a

percentage difference as a criterion. I employ cross-tabulations to analyze the effects of opportunity for contact on attitudes towards immigrants in Canada. A difference of at least 5 percent is used as a criterion to indicate substantially relevant findings. Thus, a difference in attitudes of at least 5 percent between those respondents with a high opportunity for contact with immigrants and those respondents with less opportunity for contact with immigrants signifies relevant results; a percentage difference of less than five percent indicates more trivial results.

When results fluctuate from year to year, it is useful to employ a stable summary measure to compare responses between categories of a variable. The use of one summary measure makes visual inspection of the results clearer, simplifying the reading, understanding and description of data. In statistical analysis, the three most commonly used summary measures of central tendency are the median, the value situated in the middle of a distribution, the mean, more commonly known as the average, and the mode, the most frequently occurring value in a given data set. The mode, which is less commonly used in sociological research, is appropriate when nominal data, for which no other measure of central tendency can be calculated, are used (Blalock, 1979: 69-70). As I am using percentage data, the mode would not be a very useful summary measure for this analysis. The benefit of using the mean is that it takes into account all available information, and it is often more representative of the population in general than is the median. However, a serious problem with using the mean is that it is affected by extreme values. The median is not affected by extreme values and is more appropriate when a distribution is skewed (Blalock, 1979: 66-67). In order to avoid results that are misleading, due to the presence of extreme values common to this analysis,

I will employ the median in this study.

Before beginning to analyse the data, I conducted an analysis of CIPO's independent variables to determine whether to use unweighted or weighed data. A comparison of CIPO's unweighted and weighted population figures with corresponding Statistics Canada figures determined that CIPO successfully used weighting based on both age group and sex to adjust its sample to better reflect the Canadian population. This resulted in the decision to use the weighted data. (Appendix D contains a summary of my findings.)

I also examined the patterns of non-response in each of the nine surveys and decided that it was necessary to remove several cases from my analysis. A non-response is a category in a variable where the respondent does not provide a meaningful answer to a question posed. This can be identified by either a refusal to answer a question or a "don't know" response where clearly an appropriate answer could reasonably have been obtained. "Not stated," "can't say," or "blank," where it is clear that this does not mean 'not applicable,' are further examples of non-responses. A non-response could have occurred if the respondent had ended his or her interview short because of boredom, displeasure, or engagement in other activities or had just refused to answer certain possibly sensitive questions for any number of other reasons. An examination of the patterns of non-responses in the Gallup data uncovered several cases where respondents failed to provide a meaningful response to a number of questions essential to my analysis. I decided to remove those cases where at least four of the ten necessary variables were missing. One case was removed from the 1987 sample, one from the 1990 sample, and ten from the 1993 sample (see Appendix E), reducing the final sample size to 9335 cases (or 9348 weighted cases).

Some problems associated with the analysis of opinions about immigrants should be outlined next. First of all, the term "immigrant" may cause confusion, as its meaning may be interpreted in different ways. An immigrant is a person who comes as a permanent resident to a country other than his or her native land. A distinction can be made between classes of immigrants. While family and independent class immigrants choose to come to Canada voluntarily, refugees are forced immigrants fleeing persecution and unable or unwilling to return to their home country. However, this definition of immigrants is not always considered in its entirety by the public. Canadians have often understood by "immigrant" only one or two of several classes of immigrants, such as refugees or investors. Moreover, social scientists are showing that the term "immigrant" has become a code word for 'visible minorities' hiding racist attitudes (Satzewich 1992: 29; Neuwirth 1994: 4).

Another problem associated with the analysis of attitude and opinion data is that cognition of an issue is often not assessed. Before asking attitudinal questions on immigration, surveys should provide questions measuring cognition of immigration issues to ensure that the ensuing attitudinal responses will be informed responses. For example, surveys can ask respondents specific questions on immigration policy and patterns such as to identify yearly immigration levels. Without such filter questions, it is not clear whether opinions are based on informed knowledge or on ignorance and misconceptions (Neuwirth 1994: 1,4; Tienhaara, 1974: 54).

A final point to keep in mind is that it is difficult to infer tolerance and intolerance from questions on preferred level of immigration. For example, someone who is favourable towards immigrants may feel that lower levels of immigration are necessary in light of

economic conditions and other concerns, whereas another may opt for lower levels of immigration due to racism. In Appendix A, I look more closely at this problem by examining some of the reasons why Canadians say they hold these views. It is likely that those who opt for increasing immigration do support immigration and hold more favourable attitudes towards immigrants than those who would decrease immigration. With these considerations taken into account, we can proceed to examine the findings of this analysis of attitudes towards immigrants.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Long-Term Trends

Before proceeding to test the presence of a positive relationship between contact with and attitudes towards immigrants, I will introduce some of the long-term trends present in Canada in regards to immigrant attitudes and will briefly evaluate some of the

contextual conditions underlying these attitudes. Figure 1 shows respondents' inclination to change the immigration level for selected years since 1975. In every year examined, except 1982 when the majority of respondents said they would decrease the level of immigration, the majority of Canadians stated that they would maintain or increase the current immigration level. At the same time, almost as many Canadians favoured decreasing immigration levels, and only a small minority chose to increase levels.

The proportion of Canadians in favour of increasing immigration has shifted over the past two decades. While there was a slight decline from 10 percent in 1975 to a low of 7 percent in 1982, the level steadily increased by twofold to almost 18 percent by 1990 (see Table 5). A turnaround again occurred in 1991 when the proportion of all respondents who would increase immigration fell to 14 percent and down to 11 percent by 1993. Even though

Canadians were increasingly in favour of raising immigration levels at least up until 1990, this group always remained in the minority.

Table 5: Percentage distribution of Canadian attitudes towards immigrants: "Would you be inclined to increase immigration, decrease immigration or keep the number of immigrants at about the current level?" by year

Year	Decrease	Same	Increase	Don't Know	Number	Total
1975	39.3	42.7	9.8	8.2	1067	100.0
1980	41.5	43.7	8.2	6.5	1060	100.0
1982	54.7	35.4	6.9	3.1	1066	100.0
1987	41.7	42.1	12.3	3.8	1014	100.0
1988	40.5	42.1	14.2	3.2	1046	100.0
1989	33.5	47.0	13.9	5.6	1013	100.0
1990	32.0	46.0	17.4	4.6	1050	100.0
1991	45.0	37.6	13.6	3.8	1040	100.0
1993	44.8	39.9	10.8	4.5	990	100.0

Over the same period, support for decreasing immigration initially rose to a high of 55 percent in 1982, and, then, steadily declined until 1991, when the proportion of Canadians who would decrease immigration began to rise once again. Whereas in 1975, 41 percent of Canadians preferred decreasing immigration levels, by 1990 only 32 percent of Canadians felt the same way. The proportion rose to 45 percent in 1991 and remained at that level in 1993. Support for decreasing immigration has been substantial, even in 1990 when it was at an all time low of 32 percent, compared to those who would increase immigration.

4.2 Factors Influencing These Trends

The two opposite trends of preference for accepting greater numbers of immigrants in the 1980s and for accepting fewer immigrants in the 1990s, and the notable increase in unfavourable attitudes towards immigrants in 1982 may correspond with certain contextual factors. In addition to "opportunity for contact" with immigrants (to be discussed below), the conditions under which the responses are positive and negative may vary according to

level of immigration, changing sources of immigration, and the economic climate.

4.2.1 Level of Immigration

Before I investigate further the responses to the question on preferred levels of immigration, I will briefly examine the actual level of immigration to Canada. Wide fluctuation in immigration levels have been common. After declining to a low of 121,900 in 1971, the number of immigrants entering Canada began to increase in 1972 and peaked at 218,465 in 1974 (refer to Appendix F). A series of slumps began soon after, and the level of Canadian immigration decreased to a low of 86,313 in 1978. After increasing to another high in 1980, the level began to drop suddenly in 1981 and did not begin to rise again until 1986.

These wide fluctuations mostly correspond to adjustments made by the federal government in response to stagflation and unemployment levels. The number of independent class immigrants, who are selected according to labour market conditions, was limited on several occasions as it was deemed that fewer jobs were available.⁹ The brief rise in immigration levels in the early 1980s is also noteworthy. It coincides not with an improvement in economic circumstances, but with international pressures to accept Indochinese and other refugees (Simmons 1990: 143).

The level of immigration again jumped in 1987 to 152,098, moved to 214,230 in 1990 and has remained above 250,000 since 1992. This latest upward shift coincides with the Mulroney government's policy of raising immigration levels, a decision recognizing the

⁹Family class immigrants were unaffected as their acceptance is not based on economic factors but on their relationship to Canadian citizens or landed immigrants (Simmons 1990: 143).

"economic, social, demographic, humanitarian, cultural and international benefits" immigrants bring to Canada (Hawkins, 1991: xiii-xiv). As well, these higher annual immigration levels reflect the federal government's concern with raising immigration levels to compensate for the decline in the fertility rate from 3.1 births per woman in 1965 to 1.7 in 1991 (Beaujot, 1991: 75; Dumas, 1994: 11), and its attempt to stimulate the economy by expanding business class immigration (Simmons, 1990: 143).

Figure 2 suggests that the level of immigration is inversely related to preference for decreasing immigration levels ($r = -.413$) and positively related to preference for increasing immigration levels ($r = .589$). When immigration levels were high, respondents were more likely to favour raising

immigration levels and less likely to favour decreasing them, and when immigration levels were low, respondents were less likely to support increasing immigration levels and more likely to support decreasing them.

Could the very fact that the federal government chose to increase immigration levels have suggested to Canadians that this decision must have been right and so they went along with it and asked for even higher levels? Conversely, when immigration levels were lowered, did

Canadians think there must have been a reason for lowering the level and so they called for stronger measures? Alternatively, it is possible that the Canadian government took note of public opinion and raised immigration levels when support for such policy was apparent. As we saw above, immigration levels have traditionally been adjusted to the state of the economy. The Canadian government often lowered immigration levels in poor economic times, and raised them when the economy improved. It is more likely, then, that Canadians were reacting to the level of immigration in relation to the economy, or even to the economy itself. Discrepancies which occurred after 1990 suggest that this is the case. Both immigration levels and favourable attitudes had been increasing since the mid-1980s. Immigration levels continued to rise after 1990 and yet a turnaround in opinions occurred: Canadians began to call for lower levels of immigration when the expected course would have been to continue calling for higher levels of immigration.

4.2.2 Changing Immigrant Sources

The positive trend in attitudes present up to 1990 may reflect the increased public acceptance in recent years of immigrants coming increasingly from Asia and Africa, rather than from Europe (refer to Table 4). The shift in sources of immigration had already been in progress for a decade when respondents were asked their opinions on immigration levels. The growth in acceptance of increased levels may reflect Canadians becoming increasingly accustomed to these new immigration movements, as the contact hypothesis suggests. Moreover, some respondents will have been new immigrants themselves, possibly more inclined to the idea of opening up Canada to immigrants. Still, growing accustomed to the changing nature and visibility of immigrants does not explain the recent trend of wishing to

accept fewer immigrants since 1991. It is likely, as we will see next, that the poor economic situation outweighed these positive gains in intergroup attitudes.

4.2.3 *Economic Climate*

The negative effects of poor economic climate on the opinions of Canadians towards immigration are clearly shown in Figure 3. In periods of high unemployment, the inclination to decrease immigration was high, while in periods of low unemployment, a sign of better economic times, the inclination to

decrease immigration again declined ($r = -.737$).¹⁰ For example, the rate of unemployment was high in 1982 when it rose to 11 percent from 7.6 percent the previous year. Tolerance towards immigrants decreased over the same period: in 1982 54.7 percent of Canadians would decrease immigration, up from 41.5 percent in 1980. The unemployment rate again declined in the mid-1980s and with it the preference for lowering immigration levels became less common, and the desire to increase immigration became more popular. A turn in attitudes in 1991 can also be attributed to a 2.3 percent rise in the unemployment rate from

¹⁰Some would argue that there is a lag between manifest unemployment and attitudes towards immigrants. However, upon investigating the effect of a one year lag on attitudes ($r = .200$), I discovered that there was no evidence of such a lag as the pattern was not as clear as with prevailing unemployment levels.

the 1990 level. Thus, preference for increasing immigration was inversely related to the rate of unemployment, and preference for decreasing immigration was positively related to the unemployment rate. This is consistent with a great body of literature acknowledging the effects of economic factors on prejudice towards immigrants and ethnic minorities (see for example, Tienhaara, 1974: 29-33; Palmer, 1982).

Proponents of the contact hypothesis contend that the positive effect opportunity for contact has on attitudes is reduced when competition between groups exists (refer to discussion in Chapter 2). Because immigrants are often seen as competitors for jobs, particularly when unemployment is high, it is not surprising that Canadian attitudes towards immigrants were more negative in the aforementioned periods of high unemployment and more positive when the economic situation again improved. It is likely that the negative sentiments seen in 1982 are a reflection of the combined effects of a poor economy and high immigration levels. Many Canadians, after considering both the unemployment rate and the level and type of immigration, may have felt that immigration posed a threat. The year 1982 saw both a sudden rise in unemployment rates and a brief rise in immigration levels coinciding with the acceptance of over 60,000 Southeast Asian refugees in less than three years. For some, it would not be difficult to infer that this large influx of refugees contributed to increases in unemployment. Similarly, the period after 1990 saw another recession where unemployment grew from eight percent in 1990 to over eleven percent in 1993, the media highlighted cases of refugee backlogs and incidents of so-called "queue jumping," and, as we saw above, immigration levels continued to rise. Not surprisingly, Canadian attitudes became less favourable also.

4.3 Variables Affecting Attitudes Towards Immigrants

I have examined trends in Canadian attitudes towards immigrants since the mid-1970's and some of the factors which might account for these trends. Consistent with the conditions for positive attitude change in contact situations postulated in the contact hypothesis, unemployment coupled with high levels of immigration, particularly in 1982 and after 1990, reduced the positive effects the presence of immigrants had on attitudes, by producing feelings of insecurity in some Canadians. I will now present the results of the effects of a number of variables on attitudes towards immigrants: "opportunity for contact" as measured by living in proximity to immigrants, by educational attainment and by employment status, "familiarity with immigrants" as measured by educational attainment and by mother tongue, "perceived competition" as measured by household income and by employment status, and "perceived threat" as measured by mother tongue.

4.3.1 *The Effects of Socio-Economic Status*

4.3.1.1 *The Effects of Educational Attainment*

Education produced a strong positive effect on preferred level of immigration. The more educated Canadians were, the more likely they were to support increasing immigration levels: university educated respondents were 16 percentage points more likely to favour higher immigration levels than were those with high school education or lower, and 12 percentage points more likely to support an increase in the level of immigration than were college educated respondents (refer to Table 6). Clearly, the results suggest that the greater one's educational attainment, the more favourable one is to increasing immigration levels.

Table 6: Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by educational attainment, 1975-1993

Education	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	Median
High School	8.0	7.3	5.8	8.3	11.2	10.3	12.3	9.7	7.1	8.3
College	8.0	7.2	5.7	12.4	13.6	12.0	17.8	15.0	13.7	12.4
University	20.6	13.1	11.8	26.8	24.4	26.8	28.1	25.0	14.4	21.1
Difference between Univ. & College	12.6	(5.9)*	(6.1)*	14.4	10.8	14.8	10.3	10.0	0.7	12.0
Difference between Univ. & High School	12.6	5.8	6.0	18.5	13.2	16.5	15.8	15.3	7.3	16.0

* Indicates a negative effect.

4.3.1.2 The Effects of Household Income

Though not as pronounced as educational attainment, level of household income also exhibits a positive effect on preference for raising immigration levels. Respondents with the highest incomes were 4 percentage points more likely to support raising immigration levels than were those with the lowest incomes, and almost 3 percentage points more likely to support increasing immigration than were those respondents with middle incomes (refer to Table 7).

Table 7: Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by household income group, 1975-1993

Income Group	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	Median
Lower Income	9.7	5.8	3.2	8.6	14.6	10.0	13.6	12.4	9.6	9.7
Middle Income	10.8	11.0	7.2	10.1	15.4	10.3	16.4	14.1	10.4	10.8
Upper Income	10.9	9.4	8.0	19.2	13.7	22.9	25.3	16.5	11.5	13.7
Difference between Upper & Lower	1.2	3.6	4.8	27.8	(0.9)*	12.9	11.7	4.1	1.9	4.0
Difference between Upper & Middle	0.1	(1.6)*	0.8	9.1	(1.7)*	12.6	8.9	2.4	1.1	2.9

* Indicates a negative effect.

4.3.1.3 The Effects of Employment Status

The effects of employment status on attitudes towards immigrants are minimal, both as a function of contact potential (Table 8) and as a function of perceived competition (Table 9). The percentage difference between the two categories (except in 1987) was very small,

ranging from 0.1 to 2.1 percent. The median difference in attitudes between those who were employed part- or full-time, those with a greater opportunity to be in contact with immigrants, and those who were not employed, those with less opportunity to be in contact with immigrants, was minimal at 0.7 percentage points. Similarly, the median difference in attitudes between those who were working part-time or not at all, those who might view immigrants as competitors for scarce jobs, and those working full-time, and who do not view immigrants as competitors, was only one percentage point. In both cases, no consistent pattern is evident as considerable variation occurs between the years. Thus, there is little evidence that employment status has a bearing on attitudes towards immigrants.

Table 8: Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by employment status (categories indicating contact potential), 1975-1993

Contact Potential	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	Median
Not Employed	n/a	7.6	6.5	9.3	15.2	13.0	17.6	14.2	12.1	12.6
Employed	n/a	8.6	7.2	14.2	13.4	14.5	17.4	13.3	10.0	13.4
Difference	n/a	1.0	0.7	4.9	(1.8)*	1.5	(0.2)*	(0.9)*	(2.1)*	0.7

* Indicates a negative effect.

Table 9: Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by employment status (categories indicating perceived competition), 1975-1993

Competition	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	Median
Part-time or less	n/a	7.4	6.4	9.7	15.0	13.8	16.9	13.5	10.9	12.2
Full-time	n/a	9.2	7.5	15.3	13.2	14.0	18.1	13.8	10.8	13.5
Difference	n/a	1.8	1.1	5.6	(1.8)*	0.2	1.2	0.3	(0.1)*	1.2

* Indicates a negative effect.

4.3.1.4 *The Combined Effects of Education and Other Socio-Economic Variables*

In order to determine whether the positive effect educational attainment has on attitudes towards immigrants is a function of what is learned, or the contacts one makes, at higher levels of education, or whether it is the result of the better educated having better prospects

of obtaining work and higher incomes than those with lower levels of educational attainment. I examined the joint effects of educational attainment and employment status, and the joint effects of educational attainment and household income on attitudes towards immigrants (refer to Table 10 and Table 11).

Table 10: The median proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by educational attainment, controlling for employment status (categories indicating perceived competition), controlling for employment status (categories indicating contact potential), and controlling for household income, Canada, 1975-1993

Educational Attainment	Employment Status		Employment Status		Income		
	Compet.	No Compet	No Contact	Contact	Lower	Middle	Upper
1 High School	9.4	9.7	9.0	14.2	8.0	9.1	10.2
2 College	11.9	12.0	12.8	11.9	12.6	11.2	14.5
3 University	26.0	21.3	27.7	21.8	19.8	19.1	18.2
Difference (3-1)	16.6	11.6	18.7	11.6	11.8	10.0	8.0

Table 10 is a summary of the median proportion of respondents favouring increased immigration levels, by educational attainment and each of the three labour force effects: employment status indicating perceived competition, employment status indicating contact potential, and household income. The positive effect education has on attitudes towards immigrants remains unchanged, even after controlling for each of the three labour force characteristics. Consistently, those with higher levels of education held more favourable attitudes towards immigrants than did those with lower levels of education, regardless of employment status or household income.

Moreover, the education effect appears to be more important for those with the lowest socio-economic status: those who were not employed (those with less contact opportunities), those without full-time employment (those perceiving immigrants as competitors), and for those with the lowest incomes. The gap in attitudes between those with at least some

university and those with high school education or lower is greater among those who are not employed than among those who are employed. This indicates that contact does produce a small positive effect on immigrant attitudes. The same pattern, though to a smaller degree, was found among those with lower incomes and among those without full-time employment.

Table 11: The median proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by employment status (categories indicating perceived competition), employment status (categories indicating contact potential), and household income, while controlling for educational attainment, Canada, 1975-1993

	High School	College	University	Total
<u>Employment Status:</u>				
1 Competition	9.4	11.9	26.0	12.3
2 No Competition	9.7	12.0	21.3	13.5
Difference (2-1)	0.3	0.1	(4.7)*	1.2
<u>Employment Status:</u>				
1 No Contact	9.0	12.8	27.7	12.7
2 Contact	10.2	11.9	21.8	13.4
Difference (2-1)	1.2	(0.9)*	(5.9)*	0.7
<u>Income</u>				
1 Lower	8.0	12.6	19.8	9.7
2 Middle	9.1	11.2	19.1	10.8
3 Upper	10.2	14.5	18.2	13.7
Difference (3-1)	2.2	1.9	(1.6)*	4.0

* Indicates a negative effect.

The effect household income had on attitudes towards immigrants diminished when educational attainment had been held constant (Table 11). Among respondents within each educational level, attitudes were often more favourable among those with lower incomes than among those with higher incomes. For example, among college educated respondents, those with the lowest incomes (12.6) were more open to increasing immigration levels than were those with middle-incomes (11.2), and among university educated respondents, the most affluent respondents (18.2) were more negative in their attitudes towards immigrants than were both those with middle-incomes (19.1) and those with the lowest incomes (19.8). Thus,

income does not have a clear impact on attitudes after controls for education were introduced.

The effect of employment status indicating perceived competition on attitudes towards immigrants among respondents from various educational levels was quite mixed. The effect of perceived competition diminished among high school and college educated respondents. In contrast, among university educated respondents, the direction of the effect had changed from a positive relationship to a negative relationship and the effect had increased in magnitude: those who perceived immigrants as competitors were more favourable towards immigrants than were those without such competition.

A similar result was found when the effect of "employment contact potential" on attitudes was examined. Among those with a university or college education, those who were not employed, and who likely had less opportunity for contact with immigrants, were more likely to support increased immigration levels than were those who were employed and who likely had a greater opportunity to be in contact with immigrants. Clearly, neither contact potential nor perceived competition have a clear bearing on attitudes towards immigrants when controlling for education.

Once the effects of socio-economic status on attitudes towards immigrants had been established, I undertook to look for the possibility of a spurious relationship between the variables. Education consistently produced a large positive effect on attitudes towards immigrants, and the effect remained after controlling for income and employment status. In contrast, with the exception of university respondents, once education had been controlled, "labour force effects" either diminished or remained non-existent. Only among university

educated respondents were the effects reversed, possibly a result of gender and age effects.

Thus, it appears that the differential opinions of those with different levels of educational attainment are not the result of a perceived threat due to poor job prospects and competition among those with lower levels of educational attainment and incomes. The more positive attitudes among the more educated may be a function of what is learned at the higher levels of education or possibly the contacts one makes at higher levels of education. Those attending higher levels of education likely have more contact and interaction with foreign students and immigrants than those who have lower levels of educational attainment.

4.3.2 The Effects of Opportunity for Contact

Table 12: Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by community size, 1975-1993

Population	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	Median
Under 30,000	9.0	6.1	5.4	8.9	7.5	9.7	9.9	9.0	n/a	9.0
30,000 - 100,000	12.2	8.3	3.7	2.2	13.4	7.7	12.1	18.1	n/a	10.2
100,000- 500,000	7.8	8.3	6.0	13.9	13.7	16.3	21.7	18.2	n/a	13.8
Over 500,000	11.5	10.5	9.5	16.9	20.5	18.3	22.6	16.9	n/a	16.9

Community size produced a strong positive effect on preferred level of immigration. The larger the size of the community, the greater the inclination was to increase immigration levels (refer to Table 12). Among respondents living in communities of fewer than 30,000 residents and in communities of 30,000 to 100,000 residents, areas to which few immigrants migrate, the median proportion of respondents who would increase immigration levels was quite low at 9 and 10 percent respectively. In contrast, those living in larger communities, areas with populations of 100,000 to 500,000 and areas with populations over 500,000 residents, areas to which the majority of immigrants migrate, were the most likely group to support increasing immigration levels, with 14 and 17 percent favouring higher immigration

levels. This pattern holds for almost every year looked at with only a few exceptions.

The size of one's community likely reflects the proportion of immigrants to the population, as immigrants tend to migrate to larger cities (McKie and Thompson 1994: 28). Thus, the larger the size of the community, the more likely immigrants will live in that community, and the more likely one will be in contact with immigrants. To determine whether areas with large proportions of immigrants are in fact more receptive to immigration than are respondents living in areas with fewer immigrants, we must first equate specific communities in the Gallup data with actual Census data. This is done by matching actual communities of a known size to the same sized communities of a particular province. For example, Vancouver is the only Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) in British Columbia with a population of over 500,000, Winnipeg is the only CMA in Manitoba with a population of over 500,000, and Halifax is the only CMA in Nova Scotia with a population of over 100,000 persons. We can similarly equate specific sizes of communities in Alberta (over 500,000) as Edmonton and/or Calgary, in Saskatchewan (over 100,000) as Saskatoon and/or Regina, in Ontario (over 500,000) as Toronto and/or Ottawa and/or Hamilton, and in Quebec (over 500,000) as either Montreal and/or Quebec City. All of these areas have higher proportions of immigrants than their respective provincial averages.¹¹

¹¹Quebec City, with only 2.2 percent of its population made up of immigrants in 1991, still had a larger proportion of immigrants than did other areas of the province of Quebec excluding Montreal and Quebec City (1.8 percent).

Table 13: Proportion of respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels in selected metropolitan areas, corresponding figures for the rest of the province, and the percentage difference, Canada, 1975-1993, and the proportion foreign born in selected metropolitan areas, corresponding figures for the rest of the province, and the percentage difference, Canada, 1991

Location	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	% Foreign Born in 1991
Toronto/Ottawa-Hamilton	10.4	11.0	10.3	19.7	21.7	25.0	25.2	11.0	13.1	32.5
Other Ontario	8.6	6.5	6.3	8.4	12.3	13.5	16.0	12.8	11.6	13.6
Difference	1.8	5.5	4.0	11.3	9.4	11.5	9.2	-1.8	1.5	18.5
Montreal-Quebec City	14.5	11.9	12.0	15.9	21.9	17.3	21.9	19.2	11.9	14.3
Other Quebec	11.1	10.0	3.2	12.4	10.8	7.3	12.6	10.7	5.8	1.8
Difference	3.4	1.9	8.8	3.5	11.1	10.0	9.3	8.5	6.1	12.5
Vancouver	0.0	7.5	3.5	14.9	18.1	17.6	10.1	25.8	15.9	30.1
Other British Columbia	5.6	1.3	1.2	13.6	13.2	3.9	9.1	11.9	8.5	14.8
Difference	-5.6	6.2	2.3	1.3	4.9	13.7	1.0	13.9	7.4	15.3
Edmonton-Calgary	n/a	2.8	0.0	11.2	19.1	8.5	15.5	18.1	n/a	19.3
Other Alberta	9.9	9.3	5.8	1.9	4.2	22.5	17.5	8.9	n/a	8.2
Difference	n/a	-6.5	-5.8	9.3	15.0	-14.0	-2.0	9.2	n/a	11.1
Winnipeg	19.4	13.5	9.1	16.7	10.9	4.9	43.5	19.5	n/a	17.5
Other Manitoba	10.0	4.9	14.1	3.0	8.3	10.3	14.2	0.0	n/a	5.9
Difference	9.4	8.6	-5.0	13.7	2.6	-5.4	29.3	19.5	n/a	11.6
Saskatoon-Regina	0.0	20.7	0.0	9.8	8.3	8.7	17.8	18.9	n/a	8.3
Other Saskatchewan	12.5	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.7	5.7	16.3	n/a	4.3
Difference	-13.0	14.8	0.0	9.8	8.3	-7.0	12.1	2.6	n/a	4.0
Halifax	n/a	9.0	20.4	36.5	13.6	8.0	32.2	17.7	n/a	6.5
Other Nova Scotia	n/a	4.5	14.3	5.1	6.2	3.2	3.0	5.3	n/a	3.2
Difference	n/a	4.5	6.1	31.4	7.4	4.8	29.2	12.4	n/a	3.3

Source: Estimates based on the analysis of Gallup survey results.

Table 13 provides a comparison of the percentages of respondents increasing immigration

in selected cities and the corresponding figures for the rest of the province.¹² With only a few exceptions, in every year looked at, respondents in Toronto/Ottawa/Hamilton, Montreal/Quebec City, Vancouver, and Halifax were more likely to support increased levels of immigration than were others in their provinces. The same findings were found in all but two years in Winnipeg and in Saskatoon/Regina. The only area where a higher proportion of immigrants did not prove more likely to support higher levels of immigration was in Edmonton/Calgary where in over one-half of the years examined respondents living in areas where smaller concentrations of immigrants existed were more likely to support higher immigration levels. However, in two of these four years, those living in Edmonton/Calgary were less likely to support a decrease in immigration than those living in other areas. Thus, it appears that living in areas where greater contact with immigrants is possible leads to more positive attitudes towards immigrants.

Having found that there is a systematic difference between corresponding rows of CMA's and non-CMA's, I feel that it would be worthwhile to investigate whether this pattern holds within each panel. That is, are CMAs with the greatest proportion of foreign born to the population more favourable towards immigrants than are CMAs with smaller proportions of foreign born to their population? Similarly, are the non-CMA panels with the largest proportions of foreign born more favourable towards immigrants than are those with smaller proportions of foreign born?

¹²I do not examine the long-term trends and fluctuations present between the years among respondents in particular communities as percentages in the table are based on only a small number of cases.

Table 14: Proportion of respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels in selected metropolitan areas, and corresponding figures for the rest of the province, 1975-1993, and the proportion foreign born in selected metropolitan areas, and corresponding figures for the rest of the province, 1991

Location	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	Median	% Foreign Born in 1991
Toronto/Ottawa/Hamilton	10.4	11.0	10.3	19.7	21.7	25.0	25.2	11.0	13.1	13.1	32.5
Vancouver	0.0	7.5	3.5	14.9	18.1	17.6	10.1	25.8	15.9	14.9	30.1
Edmonton/Calgary	n/a	2.8	0.0	11.2	19.1	8.5	15.5	18.1	n/a	11.2	19.3
Winnipeg	19.4	13.5	9.1	16.7	10.9	4.9	43.5	19.5	n/a	15.1	17.5
Montreal / Quebec City	14.5	11.9	12.0	15.9	21.9	17.3	21.9	19.2	11.9	15.9	14.3
Saskatoon/Regina	0.0	20.7	0.0	9.8	8.3	8.7	17.8	18.9	n/a	9.3	8.3
Halifax	n/a	9.0	20.4	36.5	13.6	8.0	32.2	17.7	n/a	17.7	6.5
Other British Columbia	5.6	1.3	1.2	13.6	13.2	3.9	9.1	11.9	8.5	8.5	14.8
Other Ontario	8.6	6.5	6.3	8.4	12.3	13.5	16.0	12.8	11.6	11.6	13.6
Other Alberta	9.9	9.3	5.8	1.9	4.2	22.5	17.5	8.9	n/a	9.1	8.2
Other Manitoba	10.0	4.9	14.1	3.0	8.3	10.3	14.2	0.0	n/a	9.2	5.9
Other Saskatchewan	12.5	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.7	5.7	16.3	n/a	5.8	4.3
Other Nova Scotia	n/a	4.5	14.3	5.1	6.2	3.2	3.0	5.3	n/a	5.1	3.2
Other Quebec	11.1	10.0	3.2	12.4	10.8	7.3	12.6	10.7	5.8	10.7	1.8

Source: Estimates based on the analysis of Gallup survey results.

Table 14 shows attitudes towards immigrants among respondents from specific communities and the corresponding figures for the rest of the province. Both the CMA panel and the non-CMA panel are placed in descending order according to the proportion of immigrants in the community in 1991. The table is structured in this way so that patterns could easily be identified: proportions of respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels in descending order will indicate that percentage presence of immigrants in one's community is related to positive attitudes towards immigrants, while the opposite pattern, proportion of respondents who would increase immigration levels in ascending order, would indicate that living in proximity to immigrants is related to negative attitudes towards immigrants.

While there is considerable variation between the categories for both the CMA and non-CMA panels (Table 14), a rank-order correlation between the proportion of foreign born and the median attitude towards immigrants does draw attention to a relationship between the two variables. Among the non-CMA sample, percentage presence of immigrants was positively related to favourable attitudes ($r = .399$), a finding supporting the idea that the greater the opportunity for contact with immigrants, the more favourable the attitude towards them. This pattern, however, did not hold for CMA areas. Among the CMA sample, there was a small inverse relationship between living in proximity to immigrants and favourable attitudes towards immigrants ($r = -.058$).

Still, there is a systematic difference between corresponding rows of CMA and non-CMA respondents (Table 13). In order to examine this relationship further, I regrouped the data from Table 13 by combining Census Metropolitan Areas into one category and non-CMA's

into another category. Table 15 shows the proportion of respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels in selected Census Metropolitan Areas and corresponding figures for non-CMA's. Consistently, those living in CMA's were more likely to support an increased level of immigration than were those living in non-CMA areas, and the median percentage difference between the two areas (7.3) is substantially relevant. Thus, there is a strong positive relationship between living in Census Metropolitan Areas, that is, where immigrants are more concentrated, and attitudes towards immigrants.

Table 15: Proportion of Canadians respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels in selected Census Metropolitan Areas and corresponding figures for non-Census Metropolitan Areas, 1975-1993

	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	Median
NON- CMA	9.2	6.6	5.2	8.4	9.5	10.7	13.0	10.7	9.9	9.5
CMA	11.2	10.7	9.5	16.8	20.2	17.9	22.6	17.0	13.3	16.8
Difference	2.0	4.1	4.3	8.4	10.7	7.2	9.6	6.3	3.4	7.3

4.3.3 *The Effects of Mother Tongue*

Table 16 shows the proportion of respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by mother tongue, and by year. Allophone respondents were clearly the most tolerant group. In every year analysed, Allophones were the most likely group to support increased levels of immigration, and the median difference of 9.6 percent between Allophone and Anglophone respondents indicates that these findings are highly relevant. This is consistent with my earlier expectation that Allophone respondents, who are likely first or second generation immigrants, would hold the most favourable attitudes towards immigrants. They likely have more contact with immigrants than the other two language groups in terms of where they live and are likely more familiar with immigrants as relatives of immigrants or immigrants themselves.

Table 16: Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by mother tongue, by year

Mother Tongue	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	Median
Anglophone	8.2	6.6	6.2	10.6	12.1	12.8	16.3	11.8	10.6	10.6
Francophone	11.3	10.1	5.3	12.9	13.6	10.0	16.0	14.7	7.9	11.3
Allophone	14.0	12.7	15.0	20.2	27.5	30.1	25.2	19.8	20.5	20.2
Difference between Anglos & Francos	(3.1)	(3.9)	0.9	(2.3)	(1.5)	2.8	0.3	(2.9)	2.7	(0.7)
Difference between Allos & Anglos	5.8	6.1	8.8	9.6	15.4	17.3	8.9	8.0	9.9	9.6

The difference in attitudes between Francophone and Anglophone respondents, however, is quite mixed. In one-half of the years looked at, Francophones were more likely than were Anglophones to favour an increase in immigration levels, and the findings were not substantially relevant in any of the nine years examined. I had also anticipated that Anglophone respondents would be more favourable towards immigrants than would Francophone respondents. Many earlier studies have presented such results (Lambert and Curtis, 1982; and White and Curtis, 1990). I had expected that Francophones, despite recent language legislation, would perceive immigrants as a threat to their language and culture, particularly if they felt that the English-majority in Canada was growing as a result of immigration. Clearly, there is no evidence of such a relationship in this analysis.

4.3.4 *The Effects of Demographic Variables*

4.3.4.1 *The Effects of Gender*

Consistently, men were more favourable to increasing immigration levels than were women, though the extent of this difference has varied over the years. Still, the findings are highly relevant as indicated by the median percentage difference of 7.5. This likely reflects the fact that men are generally exposed to a broader range of people than are women. Men are less likely than are women to stay home and look after young children and are more likely

than are women to be employed in the labour force (the majority of men in my sample were employed (69.9%) whereas the majority of women (53.6%) were not employed).

Table 17: Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by gender, 1975-1993

Gender	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	Median
Men	12.4	9.2	7.2	16.9	15.9	16.1	21.4	15.5	14.0	15.5
Women	7.2	7.2	6.5	7.7	12.7	11.8	13.6	11.9	8.0	8.0
Difference	5.2	2.0	0.7	9.2	3.2	4.3	7.8	3.6	6.0	7.5

4.3.4.2 The Effects of Age

Age did not produce a strong effect on inclination to increase immigration, as opinions varied considerably from year to year. Still, between 1975 and 1987, respondents in the middle age group were slightly more open to increasing immigration than were the two other age groups. And since that time, except for 1990, it was the oldest age group which was most likely to support an increase in immigration levels. Except for a few years (1982, 1987, 1990), the youngest age group was the least likely age group to favour higher immigration levels. However, only in one year were the findings substantially relevant: the percentage difference between the attitudes of the youngest age group and the middle age group in 1980 was 4.7 percent.

Table 18: Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by age, 1975-1993

Age Group	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	Median
18 to 29 Years	8.9	6.0	6.6	11.6	12.3	10.7	17.0	10.8	9.7	10.7
30 to 49 Years	11.3	10.7	8.5	14.0	15.1	13.7	18.3	14.4	10.0	13.7
50 Years & Over	9.0	7.8	5.4	10.8	15.5	16.8	16.9	15.5	12.6	12.6
Difference between the youngest & middle age groups	2.4	4.7	1.9	2.4	2.8	3.0	1.3	3.6	0.3	3.0

4.3.4.3 The Effects of Marital Status

Until 1988, single respondents were the most likely group to support higher immigration levels. And generally, other than married (widowed, divorced, separated) were the least

likely group to favour higher levels of immigration. However, these findings were substantially relevant only in 1987 and 1990, when the percentage difference between the attitudes of single respondents and those who were widowed, divorced or separated was 8.1 and 6.7 percent respectively.

Table 19: Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by marital status, 1975-1993

Marital Status	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	Median
Single	10.2	8.8	8.1	13.2	16.8	11.0	18.5	12.6	10.4	11.0
Married*	9.8	8.4	6.6	13.1	13.8	15.4	17.9	14.3	10.5	13.1
Wid./Div./Sep.	9.5	6.2	6.0	5.1	14.3	9.2	11.8	12.2	12.3	9.5
Difference between Single & W./D./S.	0.7	2.6	2.1	8.1	2.5	1.8	6.7	0.4	(1.9)**	1.5

* Married includes living as married.

**Indicates a negative effect.

4.3.4.4 *The Combined Effects of Gender and Other Variables*

Of the three demographic variables examined, only gender produced a large effect on attitudes towards immigrants. If the difference in attitudes between men and women is a result of differential levels of labour force participation, and hence contact potential, I would expect the effect of gender on attitudes to disappear when labour force participation is held constant. In order to determine whether the positive effect gender has on attitudes towards immigrants is a function of labour force participation, or whether it is the combined result of other demographic variables, I examined the joint effects of gender and employment status, and the joint effects of gender and various demographic characteristics on attitudes towards immigrants (refer to Tables 20, 21, and 22). Though the "gender effect" diminished for the youngest age-groups and the single respondents, in each case, men were always more likely to favour increasing immigration than were women, regardless of age, marital status, or labour force participation.

Table 20: The median proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by gender, controlling for age, 1975-1993

Age (Years)	18-29	30-49	50 +	Total
Females	7.3	12.1	8.4	8.0
Males	12.2	15.3	16.0	15.5
Difference	4.9	3.2	7.6	7.5

Table 21: The median proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by gender, controlling for marital status, 1975-1993

Marital Status	Single	Married	Wid./Div./Sep.	Living as Married	Total
Females	8.4	7.6	7.9	8.8	8.0
Males	12.6	15.8	14.9	15.0	15.5
Difference	4.2	8.2	7.0	6.2	7.5

Table 22: The median proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by gender, controlling for labour force participation, 1975-1993

Labour Force Participation	Not Working	Part-Time	Full-Time	Total
Females	10.0	8.7	9.6	8.0
Males	14.8	17.2	14.7	15.5
Difference	4.8	8.5	5.1	7.5

4.4 An Examination of the Combined Effects of Gender, Marital Status, Education and Contact with Immigrants on Attitudes Towards Immigrants

We have seen that a number of variables produce large effects on attitudes towards immigrants. These include residence in census metropolitan areas, gender, mother tongue, and education (refer to Table 23). Education produced the largest effect on attitudes towards immigrants with a median percentage difference of 15 between those with at least some university and those without a university education. The median effects of residence in CMA's and of gender are quite similar at 7.3 and 7.5 percent respectively, while the median effect of being Allophone is slightly higher at almost 9 percent. Other factors do not seem to add much to the influence of these variables. For example, the education effect remains after controlling for various labour force characteristics, and the gender effect remains after controlling for both labour force participation and various demographic variables. Moreover,

the effects of several labour force characteristics which appear to have a small impact on attitudes towards immigrants diminish when education is controlled.

Table 23: Percentage difference between proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by Census Metropolitan Area residence (residence in CMA versus non-CMA), gender (male versus female), mother tongue (Allophone versus Anglophone and Francophone), and education (university versus non-university), 1975-1993

	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	Median
CMA	2.0	4.1	4.3	8.4	10.7	7.2	9.6	6.3	3.4	7.3
Gender	5.2	2.0	0.7	9.2	3.2	4.3	7.8	3.6	6.0	7.5
Mother Tongue	4.7	5.1	9.1	8.9	14.9	18.2	9.0	7.7	10.7	8.9
Education	12.6	5.8	6.1	17.5	12.6	16.0	14.2	13.6	5.0	15.0

I now examine the extent to which residence in CMAs, gender, mother tongue, and education interact and influence attitudes towards immigrants. I use statistical controls to determine whether any of these effects are additive, for example, whether there is a "male CMA effect" equal to the sum of the effect of being male (7.5) and living in a CMA (7.3), and whether any of these effects are spurious, whether the effects diminish or disappear when controlling for certain variables.

Table 24 provides the median proportion of respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by Census Metropolitan Area residence, gender, mother tongue, and education, while controlling for each of the four variables. There does not appear to be evidence of any spurious relationship among the four variables, as no effect disappears or substantially diminishes when controlling for different variables. The effects of mother tongue and the effects of education do not change when controlling for the other variables. Nor do the effects of gender and the effects of residence in CMAs on attitudes towards immigrants succumb to change when controlling for mother tongue and education. There is a relationship, however, between gender and residence in CMAs, though the overall effects

Table 24: The median proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by Census Metropolitan Area residence, gender, mother tongue, and education, controlling for Census Metropolitan Area residence, gender, mother tongue, and education, 1975-1993

CMA		Gender		Mother Tongue		Education		No Controls	
Non-CMA	CMA	Female	Male	Anglo/Franco	Allophone	Non-Univer.	University		
CMA									
Non-CMA	n/a	n/a	7.5	12.1	8.8	17.5	7.8	22.0	9.5
CMA	n/a	n/a	9.9	20.1	15.4	23.5	13.5	25.8	16.8
Difference	n/a	n/a	2.4	8.0	6.6	6.0	5.7	3.8	7.3
Gender									
Female	7.5	9.9	n/a	n/a	7.3	16.4	7.2	21.7	8.0
Male	12.1	20.1	n/a	n/a	13.9	23.6	13.0	26.9	15.5
Difference	4.6	10.2	n/a	n/a	6.6	7.2	5.8	5.2	7.5
Mother Tongue									
Non-Allophone	8.8	15.4	7.3	13.9	n/a	n/a	8.5	23.3	11.3
Allophone	17.5	23.5	16.4	23.6	n/a	n/a	16.8	33.3	20.2
Difference	8.7	8.1	9.1	9.7	n/a	n/a	8.3	10.0	8.9
Education									
Non-University	7.8	13.5	7.2	13.0	8.5	16.8	n/a	n/a	9.4
University	22.0	25.8	21.7	26.9	23.3	33.3	n/a	n/a	24.4
Difference	14.2	12.3	14.5	13.9	14.8	16.5	n/a	n/a	15.0

of both gender and CMA residence certainly still remain evident. The effect of living in a CMA is three times greater for men (8.0) than it is for women (2.4) as seen in the second column, first row of Table 24. This may be a function of men's greater rate of labour force participation and, hence, greater contact with immigrants in CMA's where immigrants are more concentrated.

There is evidence (Table 25) that the effects of each of these variables are additive. The effects of two variables are considered additive when the sum of their combined effects (actual effects) equals the sum of their separate effects (predicted additive effects). In each case, upon adjusting the actual effects of two variables so that the base figures for the actual and predicted effects are identical, the difference between the sum of the combined effects and the sum of their separate effects was minimal. For example, there was a "male CMA effect" of 12.6 percent, just 2.2 percent smaller than the predicted additive effect of being male (7.5) and living in a CMA (7.3). Likewise, there was an "Allophone CMA effect" of 14.7 percent, slightly smaller than the predicted additive effect (16.2) of being an Allophone and living in a CMA. And, there is an "Allophone male effect" where Allophone males hold the most positive attitudes towards immigrants (and non-Allophone females hold the least positive attitudes towards immigrants), and the sum of their effect (16.3) is equal to the combined effect of being a male (7.5) and being an Allophone (8.9). Similarly, there are "university male effects" and "university Allophone effects." There is some interaction between University and CMA effects (the difference between the adjusted actual effects and the predicted effect is 4.3 percentage points), though this interaction is still quite small. Thus, each factor adds to the effect other variables have on attitudes towards immigrants and

only minimal interaction is present among all the variables except CMA and University, but this interaction is relatively small.

Table 25: Median proportional actual effects, adjusted actual median proportional effects, predicted additive effects, and the difference between adjusted actual and predicted additive median proportional effects, of Census Metropolitan Areas, gender, mother tongue, and education on attitudes towards immigrants, while controlling for each of the four variables

		(1) Actual Effect	(2) Adjusted Actual Effect	(3) Predicted Additive Effect	(4) Difference (3 - 2)
<u>CMA residence controlling for gender</u>					
Male	CMA	20.1	12.6	14.8	2.2
	Non-CMA	12.1	4.6	7.5	2.9
Female	CMA	9.9	2.4	7.3	4.9
	Non-CMA	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
<u>CMA residence controlling for mother tongue</u>					
Allophone	CMA	23.5	14.7	16.2	1.5
	Non-CMA	17.5	8.7	8.9	0.2
Non-Alloph.	CMA	15.4	6.6	7.3	0.7
	Non-CMA	8.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
<u>CMA residence controlling for education</u>					
University	CMA	25.8	18.0	22.3	4.3
	Non-CMA	22.0	14.2	15.0	0.8
Non-Univer.	CMA	13.5	5.7	7.3	1.6
	Non-CMA	7.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
<u>Gender controlling for mother tongue</u>					
Allophone	Male	23.6	16.3	16.4	0.1
	Female	16.4	9.1	8.9	0.2
Non-Alloph.	Male	13.9	6.6	7.5	0.9
	Female	7.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
<u>Gender controlling for education</u>					
University	Male	26.9	19.7	22.5	2.8
	Female	21.7	14.5	15.0	0.5
Non-Univer.	Male	13.0	5.8	7.5	1.7
	Female	7.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
<u>Mother tongue controlling for education</u>					
University	Allophone	33.3	24.8	23.9	0.9
	Non-Alloph.	23.3	14.8	15.0	0.2
Non-Univer.	Allophone	16.8	8.3	8.9	0.6
	Non-Alloph.	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
<u>Gender controlling for CMA residence</u>					
CMA	Male	20.1	12.6	14.8	2.2
	Female	9.9	2.4	7.3	4.9
Non-CMA	Male	12.1	4.6	7.5	2.9
	Female	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

Mother tongue controlling for CMA residence

CMA	Allophone	23.5	14.7	16.2	1.5
	Non-Alloph.	15.4	6.6	7.3	0.7
Non-CMA	Allophone	17.5	8.7	8.9	0.2
	Non-Alloph.	8.8	0.0	0.0	0.0

Mother tongue controlling for gender

Male	Allophone	23.6	16.3	16.4	0.1
	Non-Alloph.	13.9	6.6	7.5	0.9
Female	Allophone	16.4	9.1	8.9	0.2
	Non-Alloph.	7.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

Education controlling for CMA residence

CMA	University	25.8	18.0	22.3	4.3
	Non-Univer.	13.5	5.7	7.3	1.6
Non-CMA	University	22.0	14.2	15.0	0.8
	Non-Univer.	7.8	0.0	0.0	0.0

Education controlling for gender

Male	University	26.9	19.7	22.5	2.8
	Non-Univer.	13.0	5.8	7.5	1.7
Female	University	21.7	14.5	15.0	0.5
	Non-Univer.	7.2	0.0	0.0	0.0

Education controlling for mother tongue

Allophone	University	33.3	24.8	23.9	0.9
	Non-Univer.	16.8	8.3	8.9	0.6
Non-Alloph.	University	23.3	14.8	15.0	0.2
	Non-Univer.	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

Moreover, we can see from Table 26 that there is a notable difference in attitudes towards immigrants between "high influence respondents," university educated Allophone males living in Census Metropolitan Areas (37.5 percent), and "low influence respondents," non-Allophone, non-university educated females living in non-CMAs (5.4 percent). In fact, the sum of the combined effect of education, mother tongue, gender and proximity to immigrants (37.5) in Table 26 is remarkably similar to the sum of the separate effects of education, mother tongue, gender and proximity to immigrants ($7.3 + 7.5 + 8.9 + 15.0 = 38.7$) in Table 23. Although we must be cautious in interpreting results based on the very specific groups of "high influence" and "low influence" respondents (values in the table are based on only 97 and 125 cases respectively for the nine years, or 1 percent of the total number of cases), the pattern is consistent with our earlier findings. Clearly, all four

variables affect attitudes towards immigrants. Not only are none of the effects spurious, but together the effects are cumulative, building on the effects of the other three variables. Residence in Census Metropolitan Areas, gender, mother tongue, and education - all four variables are important in understanding attitudes towards immigrants.

Table 26: Proportion of Canadian respondents favouring an increase in immigration levels, by level of influence,* 1975-1993

Influence	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	Median
Low	5.4	5.5	3.1	4.1	4.1	5.4	8.6	8.6	6.3	5.4
Middle	11.1	9.2	8.1	14.3	16.9	16.1	19.7	14.6	12.0	14.3
High	37.5	9.1	10.6	43.7	56.8	45.3	31.8	40.1	34.6	37.5
Difference	32.1	3.6	7.5	39.6	52.7	39.9	23.2	31.5	28.3	32.1

* Allophone, university educated males living in CMAs indicates high influence; non-Allophone, non-university educated females living in non-CMAs indicates low influence; all others indicate the middle level of influence.

5. CONCLUSION

I had set out to discover the impact of opportunity for contact with immigrants on attitudes towards immigrants. I hypothesized that contact would foster positive attitudes, that this relationship would be enhanced by knowledge about and familiarity with immigrants (for example, through one's education or mother tongue), and that this relationship would be adversely affected by a poor economy and by feelings that immigrants pose a threat to one's livelihood or language and culture.

Four factors emerged as having meaningful effects on attitudes towards immigrants. Education proved to have the strongest impact, followed by mother tongue, gender, and then opportunity for contact. We saw that the greater the educational attainment, the more favourable the attitudes towards immigrants; that Allophone respondents held the most positive attitudes and that there was little difference in the attitudes of Francophones and Anglophones; that men were more favourable in their attitudes towards immigrants than were women; and that those who lived in communities with higher proportions of foreign-born, such as in CMAs, were more favourable to immigrants than were those living in communities with lower proportions of foreign-born.

All four factors lend some support to the notion that "contact" with immigrants gives rise to positive attitudes towards immigrants. Firstly, there was a strong positive relationship between living in areas where immigrants are most concentrated and where contact is most likely to occur, namely Census Metropolitan Areas, and having favourable attitudes towards immigrants. As well, we saw that Allophones, who are more likely than are other Canadians to live where immigrants are most concentrated, and, as first or possibly second or third

generation immigrants themselves, to have more intimate contact with immigrants, held more favourable attitudes towards immigrants than did either Anglophones or Francophones. The strong positive effect education had on immigrant attitudes is also consistent with the contact hypothesis. It is likely that those with higher levels of education have had more contact and interaction with foreign students and immigrants than those with lower levels of education. Finally, men were consistently more favourable in their attitudes towards immigrants than were women, a possible function of contact opportunity since men have a greater chance of meeting immigrants by reason of their higher labour force participation rates than women's and the fact that they are less likely than women to stay home with children.

Familiarity with immigrants, measured by mother tongue and educational attainment, also varied positively with attitudes towards immigrants and enhanced the effects opportunity for contact had on attitudes. There was a great difference in attitudes towards immigrants between university educated respondents and respondents with less than a university education, and between Allophones and Anglophone and Francophone Canadians. Allophones are likely immigrants themselves or close relative of immigrants, and as such, will be more familiar with immigrants than will other Canadians. Gaining knowledge about immigrants during the course of one's education, particularly at the university level, as well as gaining familiarity with immigrants through developing friendships with foreign students and immigrants at higher levels of education often strengthens positive attitudes. Moreover, the cumulative effects of proximity to immigrants and mother tongue, and, to a lesser degree, of proximity to immigrants and educational attainment indicates that familiarity indeed

enhances the relationship between contact and attitudes towards immigrants.

The other variables - income, employment status, age and marital status - proved to have either no effect on attitudes (employment status, age and marital status) or to have only spurious effects (income) as the strength of the effects either diminished or disappeared when one of the previous four effects were taken into account. Neither low income, particularly when education was held constant, nor unemployment, factors thought to incite feelings of competition in Canadians, fostered negative attitudes towards immigrants. There is, then, no support in this analysis for the notion that Canadians view immigrants negatively as a result of a perception that immigrants are considered competitors for their own livelihood.

There was also no evidence from the employment status variable to indicate that contact with immigrants that may occur in the workplace fosters positive intergroup attitudes. This may indicate a problem with the employment status measure for contact. I had hypothesized that those who worked at least part-time would have more contact with immigrants than those who did not work part-time as contact often occurs in the workplace. I had not taken into account the fact that the unemployed are more likely than are others to live in housing projects and as such would come into contact with recent immigrants and particularly refugees who are also housed there.

Moreover, mother tongue used as an indicator of "perceived threat" did not produce a meaningful effect on attitudes. Francophone Canadians, who have traditionally fought hard to protect their language and culture, were no more negative in their attitudes towards immigrants than were Anglophone Canadians. This is contrary to the idea that those who perceive immigrants as a threat to one's language and culture will be more prejudiced than

those who do not experience such a threat.

While an individual's own economic circumstances did little to affect one's attitudes towards immigrants, it is apparent that the economy in general affected attitudes. There was a strong positive relationship between the unemployment rate and the proportion of respondent's expressing negative attitudes. This pattern suggests that one's own economic circumstances factor in less than the overall state of the economy. During poor economic conditions, more respondents (even those with jobs) know others who have lost their jobs, than during good economic conditions. Thus, a poor economy is likely a signal that one's own livelihood is at risk, and the arrival of more immigrants would only intensify the threat.

I had anticipated that the greater the proportion of immigrants within a locality, the more favourable would be the attitudes towards immigrants. Somewhat surprisingly, there was no evidence of this between CMA areas. Perhaps this is a reflection of regional and local differences in terms of types of immigrants present (for example, variations by immigrant class and source country), services available to recent immigrants and refugees, such as second language and job training, and even local unemployment levels.

Unquestionably, the analysis of Canadian attitudes towards immigrants is highly complex, and no one factor can explain all variations. It is apparent, though, that a number of related factors, when looked at together, can shed light on the problem. Contact and familiarity with immigrants and economic circumstances contribute to the most positive outlooks and hence should be focused on in future studies.

There is a need for more research in the area of the effects of contact and familiarity with immigrants on attitudes towards immigrants. With dramatic increases in the number of non-

white immigrants entering Canada in recent decades, and with evidence of negative attitudes and resentment towards immigrants rising concurrently, the need for research in this area is becoming greater. Studies using more precise measures of contact, familiarity, threat, and attitudes are needed, as is an inquiry into the regional and local differences in attitudes.

6. APPENDIX A - Why Canadians say they hold these views

To understand respondents' motivations for choosing to increase or decrease immigration levels, it is helpful to ask respondents why they answered the way they did. Only in the 1975 and 1980 Gallup polls were respondents asked "why do you say that?" in response to the question on preferred levels of immigration. I will analyse the various responses for each of the three response categories from Figure 1: those who would "increase," "decrease," or leave immigration at the "same" level.

From the outset, however, it is important to note that these "reasons" cannot be assumed to be actual causes, as causality in the social sciences is often difficult to determine. Respondents do not always provide the exact reasons for what they do or say. Important factors that are involved may be ignored, and the real reason may be hidden. Nonetheless, the stated "reasons for answering the way they did" are used to guide us in our understanding of some of the determinants of attitudes towards immigration.

Tables A-1, A-2 and A-3 provide a breakdown of why respondents favoured increasing, decreasing, or maintaining immigration levels. Economic factors accounted for the majority of reasons why respondents favoured decreasing immigration levels, while population and humanitarian concerns proved the most common justification for raising immigration levels. Of those respondents who felt immigration levels should be increased (Table A-1) and who volunteered at least one reason for their opinion, the majority of respondents in both 1975 and 1980 cited non-economic factors. In 1975, the need for more people was cited by over two-fifths of all respondents who offered at least one reason: 28 percent saw the need to populate unpopulated areas, 13 percent saw a general need for more people, and another 3

percent cited both reasons. In 1980, the need to increase Canada's population was cited by one-third of all respondents who volunteered at least one reason for their decision to increase the level of immigration. Raising immigration levels for humanitarian reasons or our moral obligation was another popular reason for raising immigration levels, particularly in 1980. This reason was mentioned by 27 percent of respondents who offered at least one reason in 1980, up from just 9 percent in 1975. Two additional reasons were cited in 1975: 14 percent cited immigration as an asset to Canada and 12 percent said they would like to see immigration raised in order to change the quota of races.

Table A-1: Percentage of Respondents Citing Each Reason for Increasing Immigration Levels, Canada, 1975, 1980

Reason for Opinion on Level of Immigration	Percentage of Respondents Citing Each Reason*	
	1975	1980
Populate unpopulated areas	32 (30.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Need more people	17 (16.2%)	30 (34.3%)
Asset to Canada	15 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Change quota of races / Change character of country	13 (12.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Moral obligation / Humanitarian reasons	9 (8.6%)	23 (26.8%)
Tie immigration to job market, create more jobs	3 (2.9%)	6 (6.9%)
Tie to economy	1 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Economic situation	0 (0.0%)	14 (16.3%)
Other	29 (27.6%)	14 (16.3%)
Don't know / Not stated	n/a	5 (6.6%)
Total Number of Respondents	105	87

Source: Tabulations based on 1975 and 1980 CIPQ data.

* The columns do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed.

lying immigration to the economy or job market was mentioned by only 4 percent in 1975. By 1980, economic factors increased in frequency and were cited by almost one-quarter of all respondents who volunteered at least one reason: 16 percent cited general economic reasons and an additional 6.5 percent specifically the need to create jobs. Clearly, those who reported an inclination to increase immigration levels were aware of the social benefits of immigration and by 1980 also of the economic ones. It is interesting that some Canadians felt that increasing immigration was a way to create jobs and even solve economic problems since, as we will see next, the majority of Canadians who decided it was better to decrease immigration (and who cited at least one reason) cited economic problems as justification for their decisions.¹³

We may now inquire into whether the preference for decreasing immigration levels represents a legitimate concern about the strain on the economy, on welfare rolls and on the education budgets or whether it signifies racism. Fifty-three percent of respondents who felt immigration levels should be decreased and who volunteered at least one reason in 1975 and 63 percent in 1980 said they did so because too much unemployment existed (Table A-2).

Another four percent were concerned in 1975 with the economic situation. We must be cautious in interpreting whether "too much unemployment" and worries about the "economic situation" signify legitimate concerns with the economic climate or whether they are codes hiding respondents' prejudices. It is difficult to determine the answer without further probing into respondents' answers or correlating the responses with alternate questions related to immigration or prejudice.

¹³These two groups may have been affected differently by the economic climate.

Table A-2: Percentage of Respondents Citing Each Reason for Decreasing Immigration Levels, Canada, 1975, 1980

Reason for Opinion on Level of Immigration	Number and Percentage of Respondents Citing Each Reason*	
	1975	1980
Unemployment, Take our jobs	223 (53.2%)	278 (63.1%)
Don't need more people, Too many or enough here already	126 (30.1%)	74 (16.9%)
General negative comments	0 (0.0%)	27 (6.2%)
Undesirable immigrants	19 (4.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Lack of housing	17 (4.1%)	7 (1.5%)
Economic situation	15 (3.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Congregate in cities, not where needed	15 (3.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Leads to racial problems	14 (3.3%)	6 (1.3%)
Burden to Country	4 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Change quota of races/ Change character of country	0 (0.0%)	17 (3.9%)
Other	54 (12.9%)	21 (4.8%)
Don't know / Not stated	n/a	37 (8.3%)
Total Number of Respondents	419	440

Source: Tabulations based on 1975 and 1980 CIPQ data.

* The columns do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed.

While the majority of respondents who favoured decreasing immigration levels may have been expressing a legitimate concern with the economic climate, clearly others held negative attitudes towards immigrants. Thirty percent of those favouring lower levels of immigration in 1975, and citing at least one reason for their decision, and seventeen percent in 1980 felt that "Canada did not need more people" or that there were "too many here already." In 1975, concern about undesirable immigrants entering Canada (4.5%), immigrants congregating in cities or where they are not needed (3.6%), or suggesting immigrants are a burden to the

Table A-3: Percentage of Respondents Citing Each Reason for Maintaining Immigration Levels, Canada, 1975, 1980

Reason for Opinion on Level of Immigration	Number and Percentage of Respondents Citing Each Reason*	
	1975	1980
Unemployment. Take our jobs	159 (34.9%)	153 (32.9%)
Don't need more people. Too many or enough here already	93 (20.4%)	88 (19.1%)
Satisfied now. Good now	55 (12.1%)	65 (14.0%)
Economic Situation	20 (4.4%)	21 (4.4%)
Asset to Canada	18 (3.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Change quota of races/ Change character of country	17 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Populate unpopulated areas	14 (3.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Moral obligation / Humanitarian reasons	12 (2.6%)	17 (3.7%)
Tie immigration to job market, create more jobs	10 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Undesirable immigrants	8 (1.8%)	0 (0.0%)
Lack of housing	7 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Congregate in cities, not where needed	7 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Leads to racial problems	5 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Burden to Country	5 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Tie to economy	3 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Same level - qualified	0 (0.0%)	15 (3.2%)
Other	59 (12.9%)	41 (8.7%)
Don't know / Not stated	n/a	66 (14.2%)
Total Number of Respondents	456	464

Source: Tabulations based on 1975 and 1980 CIPO data. * Columns do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed.

country (1%) were additional reasons Canadians cited for choosing to decrease immigration.

In 1980, 6 percent provided general negative comments, and 4 percent felt the character of

the country would be changed if immigration levels were not decreased. In addition, another 7 percent in 1975 and 3 percent in 1980 were concerned either with a lack of housing or with racial problems. Each of these responses associates the presence of immigrants with problems, suggesting that immigrants are being used as scapegoats for economic, social and other problems.¹⁴

Among respondents who would maintain the same level of immigration and who volunteered at least one reason for their opinion, economic reasons were again cited most often (Table A-3). This may suggest that if the economic situation were better, Canadians would be inclined to support an increase in immigration levels. Given that unemployment rates have declined since 1983 and that support for increasing immigration levels has increased, this hypothesis may be tenable. Thus, both economic factors and population issues played a part in respondents' opinions on immigration levels.

¹⁴Given the media's often negative coverage of immigration issues (see van Dijk, 1988; Khaki, 1988), these connections are not surprising.

7. APPENDIX B - Technical information related to the Gallup poll data

This study uses Gallup Poll data collected by the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion (CIPO) in June 1975, September 1980, November 1982, March 1987, March 1988, August 1989, September 1990, June 1991 and December 1993. CIPO conducted face to face interviews in respondent's homes between 1975 and 1990 and telephone interviews in 1991 and 1993. The samples include adults, 18 years and older, living in Canada, except for those persons in institutions, or those residing in Labrador, the Yukon or the Northwest Territories

CIPO employed a modified probability sample in areas with populations over 1,000, and a quota sample in rural farm and rural non-farm areas. Census Enumeration Areas were first stratified according to community size, then arranged in geographic order, and finally selected randomly. In urban centres, city blocks were then randomly selected to determine where interviews would be conducted, and quota sampling based on sex and age was employed to select interviewees. In rural farm and rural non-farm areas, quota sampling based on sex and age replaced the random block sampling procedure.

8. APPENDIX C - Detailed list of questions and response categories, 1975-1993¹⁵

C.1 *Attitude Towards Immigrants*

CIPO Poll (June 1975, September 1980, November 1982, March 1987, March 1988, August 1989, September 1990, June 1991, December 1993)

"If it were your job to plan an immigration policy for Canada at this time, would you be inclined to increase immigration, decrease immigration or keep the number of immigrants at about the current level?"

Category Label	Frequencies by Year								
	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993
Increase	105	87	73	124	149	141	182	142	108
Decrease	419	440	583	424	424	339	336	468	443
Same Level	456	464	377	428	440	476	483	391	396
Don't Know	87	69	29	38	30	57	49	38	40
Not Stated	n/a	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	n/a
Blanks	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Refused	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3
Total	1067	1060	1066	1014	1046	1013	1050	1040	990

C.2 *Gender*

CIPO Poll (June 1975, September 1980, November 1982, March 1987, March 1988, August 1989, September 1990, June 1991, December 1993)

[Gender was coded by the interviewer.]

Category Label	Frequencies by Year								
	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993
Male	539	530	533	498	504	493	511	506	482
Female	528	530	533	516	542	520	539	534	508
Total	1067	1060	1066	1014	1046	1013	1050	1040	990

¹⁵All figures refer to weighted Gallup data and only those cases used in this analysis (refer to Appendix E for a list of those cases that were removed from this analysis)

C.3 Age Group

CIPO Poll (June 1975, September 1980, November 1982, March 1987, March 1988, August 1989, September 1990, June 1991, December 1993)

"What was the year of your birth?"

[Grouped into exact age and then age group by me (1975) and by the Carleton University Social Science Data Archives (1980-1993)]

Category Label	Frequencies by Year								
	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993
18 to 29 Years	291	339	329	320	336	287	299	295	237
30 to 39 Years	215	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
40 to 49 Years	183	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
30 to 49 Years	n/a	367	376	358	350	383	398	393	396
50 Years & Older	377	344	346	330	354	336	348	344	321
Not Stated	1	10	16	7	n/a	7	5	7	36
Total	1067	1060	1066	1014	1040	1013	1050	1040	990

C.4 Marital Status

CIPO Poll (June 1975, September 1980, November 1982, March 1987, March 1988, August 1989, September 1990, June 1991, December 1993)

"What is your marital status?"

Category Label	Frequencies by Year								
	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993
Single	205	210	234	212	219	213	241	221	246
Married	746	749	689	600	597	647	655	624	543
Wid. Div. Sep.	116	100	143	151	143	98	111	133	139
Living as Married	n/a	n/a	n/a	43	38	46	41	61	50
Not Stated	n/a	1	n/a	1	3	8	2	1	n/a
Refused	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	12
Blanks	n/a	n/a	n/a	8	45	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	1067	1060	1066	1014	1046	1013	1050	1040	990

C.5 Mother Tongue

CIPO Poll (June 1975, September 1980, November 1982, March 1987, March 1988, August 1989, September 1990, June 1991, December 1993)

"What was the language you first spoke in childhood and still understand?"

Category Label	Frequencies by Year								
	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993
English	620	648	673	620	629	628	649	623	610
French	326	288	280	286	298	273	268	276	276
Other	121	124	112	103	118	110	127	141	104
Not Stated	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	1	2	7	n/a	n/a
Total	1067	1060	1066	1014	1046	1013	1050	1040	990

C.6 Province

CIPO Poll (June 1975, September 1980, November 1982, March 1987, March 1988, August 1989, September 1990, June 1991, December 1993)

[Province of residence was coded by the interviewer.]

Category Label	Frequencies by Year								
	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993
Newfoundland	21	20	30	19	28	20	28	31	17
Prince Edward Island	10	n/a	10	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	9
Nova Scotia	n/a	49	40	51	41	41	40	31	31
New Brunswick	59	31	20	16	20	38	37	40	24
Quebec	311	290	281	282	276	256	268	263	n/a
Montreal	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	118
Other Quebec	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	145
Ontario	378	382	384	356	376	358	370	366	n/a
Toronto	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	130
Other Ontario	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	228
Manitoba	51	39	60	52	50	39	48	49	42
Saskatchewan	42	41	39	32	30	38	50	62	40
Alberta	81	97	71	100	104	103	92	78	86
British Columbia	114	112	132	106	120	119	117	120	n/a
Vancouver	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	60
Other BC	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	61
Total	1067	1060	1066	1014	1046	1013	1050	1040	990

C.7 Community Size

CIPO Poll (June 1975, September 1980, November 1982, March 1987, March 1988, August 1989, September 1990, June 1991, December 1993)

[Size of community was coded by the interviewer.]

Category Label	Frequencies by Year								
	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993
Over 500,000	339	401	397	429	443	433	448	453	n/a
100,000 - 500,000	180	140	151	113	110	109	123	109	n/a
30,000 - 100,000	90	88	82	80	93	91	89	84	n/a
10,000 - 30,000	81	71	78	70	69	70	56	59	n/a
Under 1,000	377	359	358	322	331	311	333	334	n/a
Total	1067	1060	1066	1014	1046	1013	1050	1040	n/a

C.8 Type of Community

CIPO Poll (June 1975, September 1980, November 1982, March 1987, March 1988, August 1989, September 1990, June 1991, December 1993)

[Community type was coded by the interviewer.]

Category Label	Frequencies by Year								
	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993
Farm	98	75	73	37	31	33	38	39	n/a
Rural, Non-Farm	184	178	224	193	204	182	189	197	n/a
Urban	784	808	769	777	766	799	823	804	n/a
Missing	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Blanks	n/a	n/a	n/a	8	45	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	1067	1060	1066	1014	1046	1013	1050	1040	n/a

C.9 Employment Status

CIPO Poll (September 1980)

"Do you, yourself, work outside the home full-time, part-time or not at all?"

CIPO Poll (November 1982, March 1987, March 1988, August 1989, September 1990, June 1991, December 1993)

"Are you employed outside the home full-time, part-time or not at all?"

Category Label	Frequencies by Year								
	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993
Full Time	n/a	453	423	420	428	509	497	482	433
Part Time	n/a	127	143	144	141	107	134	138	160
Not at All	n a	475	495	440	477	395	413	420	392
Don't Know	n/a	n a	n a	n/a	n/a	n a	n a	n a	n/a
Not Stated	n a	5	6	2	n/a	1	6	n a	5
Blanks	n/a	n a	n a	8	n/a	n/a	n a	1	n a
Total	n a	1060	1066	1014	1046	1013	1050	1040	990

C.10 Educational Attainment

CIPO Poll (June 1975)

"What was the name of the last school you attended? How far did you go?"

C IPO Poll (September 1980, November 1982, March 1987, March 1988, August 1989, September 1990, June 1991, December 1993)

"Which of these was the last school that you attended? Did you graduate?"

Category Label*	Frequencies by Year								
	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993
Refused/Not Stated	3	4	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	6	3	34
Some Public	121	78	88	79	82	61	54	77	35
Graduated Public	104	81	68	71	77	59	86	82	41
Some Secondary	278	262	248	216	238	182	147	163	122
Graduated Secondary	288	309	274	268	238	289	271	259	241
Some C.E.G.E.P.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25
Graduated C.E.G.E.P.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	31
Some Technical	62	44	70	79	76	69	78	96	46
Graduated Technical	51	103	117	130	130	154	155	181	144
Some University	65	74	79	64	79	53	101	59	62
Graduated University	95	105	121	106	124	144	152	119	206
No Formal Schooling	n/a	1	2	n/a	2	2	n/a	2	3
Blank	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	n/a
Total	1067	1060	1066	1014	1046	1013	1050	1040	990

* In 1975, "graduated" is replaced by "completed." Technical is replaced by "post-secondary, non-university" in 1989, 1990, and 1993, and by "Community college/ C.E.G.E.P." in 1991.

C.11 Household Income

CIPO Poll (June 1975, September 1980, November 1982, March 1987, March 1988, August 1989, September 1990)

"Which number on this card corresponds to your total annual family income from all sources before tax deductions?"

CIPO Poll (June 1991, December 1993)

"Please tell me your total annual family income from all sources before tax deductions. Is it [Read: Under \$10,000; \$10,000 to less than \$15,000; \$15,000 to less than \$20,000; \$20,000 to less than \$30,000; \$30,000 to less than \$40,000; \$40,000 to less than \$50,000; \$50,000 to less than \$60,000; \$60,000 to less than \$70,000; \$70,000 to less than \$80,000; \$80,000 and Over]?"

Category Label	Frequencies by Year								
	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993
Under \$4,000	99	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Under \$6,000	n/a	55	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$4,000 to \$5,999	95	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$6,000 to \$7,999	75	46	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$8,000 to \$9,999	107	42	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$10,000 to \$12,999	156	72	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$13,000 to \$14,999	106	37	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Under \$10,000	n/a	n/a	160	104	86	55	68	45	49
\$10,000 to \$14,999	n/a	n/a	98	96	95	62	67	75	43
\$15,000 to \$19,999	129	151	113	81	98	52	57	53	66
\$20,000 or More	145	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$20,000 to \$29,999	n/a	203	206	155	145	125	119	147	86
\$30,000 and Over	n/a	204	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$30,000 to \$39,999	n/a	n/a	134	144	142	145	145	136	134
\$40,000 and Over	n/a	n/a	140	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$40,000 to \$49,999	n/a	n/a	n/a	125	103	150	123	127	88
\$50,000 and Over	n/a	n/a	n/a	150	172	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$50,000 to \$59,999	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	95	103	90	83
\$60,000 to \$69,999	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	53	62	68	54
\$70,000 and Over	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	99	124	n/a	n/a
\$70,000 to \$79,999	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	39	34
\$80,000 and Over	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	78	73
Refused/Not Stated	155	250	216	158	204	176	182	184	280
Total	1067	1060	1066	1014	1046	1013	1050	1040	990

9. APPENDIX D - A comparison of weighted and unweighted gallup poll data, 1975-1993

I conducted an analysis of the Gallup Poll data in order to determine whether to use the weighted or unweighted samples.¹⁶ To this end, I consulted numerous Statistics Canada documents and compared its population figures with those used by the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion (CIPO) in its Gallup Polls. I used a measure called the index of dissimilarity to compare the weighted and unweighted percentage distributions with each other. The index of dissimilarity is calculated simply by halving the summed absolute difference between each of the two percentage distributions: the Gallup data and the corresponding Statistics Canada figures. The formula for calculating the index of dissimilarity is as follows:

$$\text{Index of Dissimilarity} = a,b = 1/2 \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i - b_i|$$

The smaller the index of dissimilarity, the more closely the two percentage distributions resemble each other (Matras, 1977: 389-390).

An example will help illustrate this. Table D-1 is an example of the computation of the index of dissimilarity for the variable sex. The absolute difference between the two percentage distributions of each category is calculated first: the difference between the proportion of males provided by Statistics Canada (49.0%) and the proportion provided by Gallup (48.7%) is 0.3 percent, and the difference between the proportion of females given by Statistics Canada (51.0%) and the proportion of females given by Gallup (51.3%) is 0.3 percent. The sum of the absolute difference between the two categories is 0.6 percent, and

¹⁶Weighting is a method used to adjust a sample from a population where a segment has been either over- or under-sampled (SPSS-X Inc., 1988: 186).

dividing this sum by two yields 0.3 percent. Hence, the index of dissimilarity of the two sex distributions is 0.3 percent. As Matras (1977: 390) explains, "the index of dissimilarity indicates the minimum proportion in one or the other population which would have to change categories

in order for the two distributions to be identical." To return to our example, then, 0.3 percent of the female population in the weighted Gallup data would have to change categories (that is, .3 percent more males and .3 percent fewer females should have been sampled) in order for the distribution of males and females in the 1991 Gallup poll sample to be identical to the Canadian population, as shown in the Statistics Canada figures.

I calculated both the indexes of dissimilarity for the weighted Gallup samples and the unweighted Gallup samples for each of nine independent variables: age, sex, marital status, religion, mother tongue, province, community size, educational attainment and family income, for each of the years 1975, 1980, 1982, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991 and 1993 (Table D-2 and Table D-3). Table D-4 (below) provides a summary of the differences between the weighted and unweighted samples. A positive figure indicates a closer fit between the *weighted* data and Statistics Canada data, whereas a negative result demonstrates a closer fit between the *unweighted* Gallup data and Statistics Canada data. An examination

TABLE D-1
Computation of the Index of Dissimilarity for Sex, for Respondents 18 Years and Older, for Canada, 1991

Sex	Statistics Canada Percentage Distribution	Gallup Weighted Percentage Distribution	Absolute Difference
Male	49.0	48.7	0.3
Female	51.0	51.3	0.3
Sum of Absolute Difference			0.6
Half the Summed Absolute Difference			0.3
Index of Dissimilarity = Half the Summed Absolute Difference / 0.3%			

2 OF 2

PM-1 3 1/2" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

of the results shows that the weighted variables are the better data to use. Only in 1988 did the unweighted sample fit better than the weighted sample with corresponding Statistics Canada figures. In all other years, the sum of the differences between the indexes of dissimilarity of the weighted and unweighted samples produced a positive result, indicating a closer fit between the weighted data and Statistics Canada data. Thus, the weighted Gallup Poll samples are used in this analysis.

Table D-2: Matrix of indexes of dissimilarity for the weighted Gallup data with Statistics Canada data, 1980-1991

	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Age	1.2	1.6	3.5	5.9	2.2	2.8	3.6
Sex	0.7	0.8	0.1	0.9	0.5	0.4	0.3
Marital Status	3.2	3.8	9.6	11.4	5.3	4.2	7.6
Mother Tongue	2.8	4.1	4.9	4.2	4.8	3.6	3.3
Religion	1.9	5.6	5.3	4.7	3.8	5.3	1.8
Province	2.1	3.8	5.3	3.3	3.4	4.0	5.5
Education	15.7	12.7	12.4	9.5	11.9	10.7	10.2
Income*	25.4	28.0	24.5	28.7	21.4	22.8	22.0
Community Size	3.5	4.6	4.6	2.5	2.6	3.0	2.8

Source: Figures based on the analysis of Gallup data and data from Statistics Canada and the 1981, 1986 and 1991 Censuses.

* The high index of dissimilarity for income is a reflection of the high number of refusals.

Table D-3: Matrix of indexes of dissimilarity for the unweighted Gallup data with Statistics Canada data, 1980-1991

	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Age	7.5	6.3	3	1.6	4.8	8.7	5.2
Sex	0.5	1.0	1.2	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.0
Marital Status	6.3	4.1	9.7	10.6	5.5	5.7	7.2
Mother Tongue	2.8	3.9	4.7	4.9	4.3	3.2	3.5

	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Religion	1.8	5.7	5.6	5.1	4.3	5.8	1.2
Province	2.2	3.8	4.7	3.5	3.3	4.5	5.3
Education	15.8	12.5	12.3	9.8	12.1	10.9	10.6
Income*	24.6	27.8	24.6	27.2	21.7	22.4	20.6
Community Size	3.6	4.8	4.3	2.7	3.0	3.1	2.8

Source: Figures based on the analysis of Gallup data and data from Statistics Canada and the 1981, 1986 and 1991 Censuses.

* The high index of dissimilarity for income is a reflection of the high number of refusals.

Table D-4: Differences between the indexes of dissimilarity of Statistics Canada and weighted Gallup data and the indexes of dissimilarity of Statistics Canada and unweighted Gallup data, 1980-1991

	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Age	6.3	4.7	-0.5	-4.3	2.6	5.9	1.6
Sex	-0.2	0.2	1.1	-0.2	0.3	0.5	0.7
Marital Status	3.1	0.3	0.2	-0.8	0.2	1.5	-0.5
Mother Tongue	-0.1	-0.2	-0.2	0.7	-0.5	-0.4	0.2
Religion	-0.1	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.5	-0.6
Province	0.1	0.1	-0.6	0.2	-0.1	0.6	-0.2
Education	0.1	-0.2	-0.1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.4
Income	-0.9	-0.2	0.2	-1.6	0.3	-0.4	-1.5
Community Size	0.1	0.2	-0.3	0.2	0.4	0.1	-0.1
Sum of the Differences	8.5	5.0	0.0	-5.0	3.8	8.5	0.2
Sum of the Differences Excluding Age	2.2	0.3	0.5	0.7	1.2	2.6	-1.4

Source: Figures based on the analysis of Gallup data and data from Statistics Canada and the 1981, 1986 and 1991 Censuses.

10. APPENDIX E - An analysis of non-responses in Gallup poll data: 1975-1993

It is important to examine patterns of non-responses before beginning more elaborate analyses of surveys in order to determine whether all cases can be kept or whether certain cases should be excluded. The first method of examining patterns of non-responses is a "row-wise" or case by case analysis. After identifying all the values in each variable where persons provided non-responses, I isolated these responses in a new variable using the "count" command. This technique is useful in that it counts the number of occurrences of the specified non-response values across all the variables or questions asked of the respondent (SPSS-X Inc., 1988, 132). I then "listed" all the cases that had at least two of the specified non-response variables and examined each case to see which variables were missing.

I set out to identify those cases where respondents failed to answer a series of questions essential to my analysis. It is important to stress that a problem will not necessarily arise if a whole string of variables are non-responses. Only in those instances where respondents repeatedly failed to answer specific questions essential to this analysis would difficulties develop and thus decisions about keeping such cases have to be made. I decided to remove those cases where at least four of the ten necessary variables were missing.

After examining the patterns of non-responses in the Gallup data (see Table E-1 below), I found that only a handful of cases had to be thrown out. No problems were found in 1975, 1980, 1982, 1988 or 1991; the highest number of required variables missing for each case was two, most often "don't know" to the question on immigration levels and "refused" to the question on income. To a smaller degree, people refused to answer the income and age or

income and education questions. Four persons in 1987, one in 1989 and fourteen in 1993 had three non-responses to the ten required questions. Again this did not create a serious problem and so none of these cases were removed.

Table E-1: Sum of Non-Responses in Each Gallup Poll, by Year, 1975-1993

Sum of Non-Responses	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993
0	841	755	812	813	772	789	809	830	655
1	206	278	239	176	243	198	223	193	262
2	20	29	15	19	20	25	18	17	50
3	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	14
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9
6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total Cases	1067	1062	1066	1013	1035	1013	1051	1010	1000

Source: Figures based on the analysis of Gallup Poll data

One case in 1987, one case in 1990, and nineteen cases in 1993 did have four or more non-responses and thus could be identified as creating problems. After analyzing the patterns of non-responses for each case in the 1987 sample, I decided to remove one case. The particular case had at least six missing variables. A man living in a Manitoba community of 500,000 persons or larger would increase immigration. We know nothing of his age, marital status, mother tongue, education, income or employment status. His religion is no religious preference suggesting a seventh non-response. One case was also removed from the 1990 sample. This case had thirteen non-responses to the 45 questions asked. More importantly, several variables that are central to my analysis were missing: marital status, mother tongue, educational attainment, employment status, and religion (no religious

preference suggests not stated in this case).

In looking at the patterns of non-responses in the 1993 sample, I decided to remove ten cases where at least six responses to necessary variables were missing. The first was a New Brunswick man who would decrease immigration levels. Nothing else is known about him - not his employment status, marital status, mother tongue, religion, income, education, or age. The second case was an unemployed, English mother-tongue Alberta woman. She failed to provide an adequate response to questions on her marital status, religion, income, education, age, and level of immigration. The third respondent to be excluded was an unemployed, (not from Toronto) Ontario woman who would maintain immigration levels. She did not provide information on her marital status, mother tongue, religion, income, education or age. Another case that was removed is that of an (other than Toronto) Ontario man whose mother tongue is English. Information on his employment and marital status is missing, as is his religion, age, income, educational attainment and opinion on immigration levels. The fifth excluded case is that of a Francophone Quebec man living outside Montreal who would decrease immigration levels. Other information (employment status, marital status, religion, age, income and educational attainment) is missing. The sixth is an Alberta woman who would decrease immigration. No other information is available. The seventh is an English mother tongue Alberta woman who would maintain immigration levels. Nothing else is known about her. Two other cases that were removed are a Toronto woman who would decrease immigration, and a Nova Scotia man who would decrease immigration. Nothing else is known about them. And finally, an unemployed (other than Toronto) Ontario man who would increase immigration was excluded as nothing else was known about him. Nine

further cases had four non-responses in 1993. As responses to mother tongue and immigration were available they were kept in the analysis. Thus, twelve cases were removed before beginning an analysis of the Gallup data: one in 1987 and 1990 and ten in 1993.

In addition to examining each case for patterns of non-responses, I screened each variable for similar tendencies towards producing non-responses. Where non-responses constituted at least five percent of a variable's value, I examined the variable in relation to other variables. In each of the Gallup polls examined, non-responses proved to comprise from between 15 percent and 28 percent of the income variable's value. "Opinion on the immigration level" was the only other variable (essential to my analysis) where non-responses constituted at least five percent. Non-responses accounted for 8 percent of immigration responses in 1975, 7 percent in 1980, and 5 percent in 1989 and 1990. Table F-2 (below) illustrates relationships that exist between income non-responses and non-responses among other variables. Income non-responses occur most often with non-responses to questions on immigration levels as well as age, and to a smaller degree religion and education. It does not seem as though there is much to worry about here.

Table F-2: Income Non-Responses: Cross-Sections with Non-Responses of Other Variables in each Gallup Poll, by Year, Gallup Polls, 1975-1993

Cross-Sections with Income	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993
Immigration	18	19	10	9	6	17	12	9	8
Age	0	7	4	6	3	5	1	4	16
Religion	n a	n a	n a	n a	n a	n a	n a	n a	11
Education	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	6
Marital Status	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
Employ	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	1	1

Cross-Sections with Income	1975	1980	1982	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993
Mother Tongue	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Marital Status & Farm	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0
Age & Education	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Immigration & Religion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Marital Status & Age	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	5
Age & Religion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Religion & Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Immigration & Age	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Religion & Marital Status	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Age, Religion & Marstat	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Age, Religion & Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Marstat, Employ & Farm	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Age, Employ & Educ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Age, Employ & Marstat	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Age, Marstat, Religion, Educ & Mtongue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Age, Marstat, Religion, Educ, & Employ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Age, Marstat, Religion, Educ & Immigration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Age, Marstat, Religion, Educ, Employ, Mtongue	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Age, Marstat, Religion, Educ, Employ, Immigration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Source: Figures based on the analysis of Gallup Poll data.

II. APPENDIX F - Level of Canadian immigration, 1955-1993

Figure F-1

Table F-1: Level of Canadian Immigration, 1950-1993

Year	#	Year	#	Year	#	Year	#
1955	109,946	1965	146,758	1975	187,881	1985	84,302
1956	164,857	1966	194,743	1976	149,429	1986	99,219
1957	282,164	1967	222,876	1977	114,914	1987	152,098
1958	124,851	1968	183,974	1978	86,313	1988	161,929
1959	106,928	1969	164,531	1979	112,093	1989	192,001
1960	104,111	1970	147,713	1980	143,117	1990	241,230
1961	71,698	1971	121,900	1981	128,618	1991	230,781
1962	74,586	1972	122,006	1982	121,147	1992	252,842
1963	93,151	1973	184,200	1983	89,157	1993	254,321
1964	112,606	1974	218,465	1984	88,239		

Source: Citizenship and Immigration Canada, *Facts and Figures - Overview of Immigration 1994* (Ottawa, Minister of Supply and Services: 1994).

12. REFERENCES

Allport, Gordon W.

1954 *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Amir, Yehuda

1969 "Contact Hypothesis in Ethnic Relations." *Psychological Bulletin* 71 (May): 319-342.

1976

"The Role of Intergroup Contact in Changes in Prejudice and Ethnic Relations," in Phyllis A. Katz, (Ed.), *Towards the Elimination of Racism*, pp. 245-308. New York: Pergamon Press Inc.

Beaujot, Roderic

1990 *Research Abstract, Immigration and the Population of Canada*. Ottawa: Employment and Immigration Canada.

1991

Population Change in Canada: The Challenges of Policy Adaptation. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Inc.

Behiels, Michael D.

1991 *Quebec and the Question of Immigration: From Ethnocentrism to Ethnic Pluralism, 1900-1985*. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association.

Berry, John W.

1984 "Cultural Relations in Plural Societies: Alternatives to Segregation and Their Sociopsychological Implications," in Norman Miller and Marilyn B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in Contact: The Psychology of Desegregation*. Orlando: Academic Press, Inc.

Berry, John W. et al

1977 *Multiculturalism and ethnic attitudes in Canada*. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.

Berry, John W. and Rudolf Kalin

1979 "Reciprocity of inter-ethnic attitudes in a multicultural society." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 3: 99-112.

Blalock, Hubert M.

1960 *Social Statistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

- Brophy, Ira N.
1945 "The Luxury of Anti-Negro Prejudice." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 9: 456-466.
- Burnet, Jean
1981 "The Social and Historical Context of Ethnic Relations," in Robert C. Gardner and Rudolf Kalm (Eds.), *A Canadian Social Psychology of Ethnic Relations*. Toronto: Methuen Publications.
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada
1994a *Annual Report to Parliament: Immigration Plan 1994*. Ottawa: Citizenship and Immigration Canada.
- 1994b *Facts and Figures: Overview of Immigration*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- 1994c *Immigration Statistics: Annual*. Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada. (Cat. No. MP22-1 1968-1992)
- Clement, R. *et al*
1977 "Inter-ethnic contact: Attitudinal consequences." *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science* 9 (3): 205-215.
- Cook, Stuart W.
1962 "The Systematic Analysis of Socially Significant Events: A Strategy for Social Research." *Journal of Social Issues* 18 (2): 66-84.
- 1984 "Cooperative Interaction in Multiethnic Contexts," in Norman Miller and Marilyn B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in Contact: The Psychology of Desegregation*. Orlando: Academic Press, Inc.
- Curtis, James F. and Philip G. White
1993 "Proximity or regional cultures? A re-examination of patterns of Francophone-Anglophone liking of each other." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 18 (3) 303-311.
- Dirks, Gerald E.
1995 *Controversy and Complexity: Canadian Immigration Policy during the 1980s*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Deutsch, Morton and Mary E. Collins
1951 *Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment*. New York: Russell & Russell.

DeVoretz, Don J. (ed.)

- 1995 *Diminishing Returns: The Economics of Canada's Recent Immigration Policy*. Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.

Dumas, Jean

- 1994 *Report on the Demographic Situation in Canada, 1993: Current Demographic Analysis*. Ottawa: Minister of Industry, Science and Technology.

Economic Council of Canada

- 1991 *Economic and Social Impacts of Immigration*. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

Frideres, James S.

- 1989 *Multiculturalism and Intergroup Relations*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Guimond, Serge *et al.*

- 1989 "Education, academic program and intergroup attitudes." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 26 (2): 193-216.

Halli, Shiva S. *et al.* (eds.)

- 1990 *Ethnic Demography: Canadian Immigrant, Racial and Cultural Variations*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Harwood, Edwin

- 1986 "American Public Opinion and U.S. Immigration Policy: A Critical Assessment." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 487 (9): 201-212.

Hawkins, Freda

- 1988 *Canada and Immigration: Public Policy and Public Concern*, 2nd ed. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- 1991 *Critical Years in Immigration: Canada and Australia Compared*, 2nd ed. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Hendrick, Clyde (ed.)

- 1987 *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

- Hewstone, Miles and Rupert Brown (eds.)
1986 *Contact and Conflict in Intergroup Encounters*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Immigration Canada
1993 *Canada's Immigration Law*. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services Canada.
- Jackman, Mary R. and Marie Crane
1986 "Some of my best friends are black . . . : Interracial Friendship and White's Racial Attitudes," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 50: 459-486.
- Jackson, Winston
1988 *Research Methods: Rules for Survey Design and Analysis*. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.
- Joy, Richard J.
1992 *Canada's Official Languages: The Progress of Bilingualism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kalin, Rudolf and John W. Berry
1980 "Geographic Mobility and Ethnic Tolerance." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 112: 129-134.
- 1982 "The social ecology of ethnic attitudes in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science* 14 (2): 97-109.
- Khaki, Aziz
1988 *Depiction and Perception: Native Indians and Visible Minorities in the Media*. Vancouver: Ad Hoc Committee for Better Race Relations.
- Lambert, Ronald and James F. Curtis
1982 "The French- and English-Canadian language communities and multicultural attitudes." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 14 (2): 43-58.
- Leacy, F.H. (ed.)
1983 *Historical Statistics of Canada*, 2nd ed. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Li, Peter S.
1992 "The Economics of Brain Drain: Recruitment of Skilled Labour to Canada, 1954-1986," in Vic Satzewich (Ed.), *Deconstructing a Nation: Immigration, Multiculturalism & Racism in '90s Canada*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

- Li, Peter S. (ed.)
1990 *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Matras, Judah
1977 *Introduction to Population: A Sociological Approach*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- McKie, Craig and Keith Thompson
1994 *Canadian Social Trends: A Canadian Studies Reader, Volume 2*. Toronto: Thompson Education Publishing, Inc.
- Miller, Norman and Marilyn B. Brewer (eds.)
1984 *Groups in Contact: The Psychology of Desegregation*. Orlando: Academic Press, Inc.
- Moore, Stephen
1986 "Social Scientists' Views on Immigrants and U.S. Immigration Policy: A Postscript." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 487 (9): 213-217.
- Neuwirth, Gertrud
1994 "Decima Survey Does Not Fulfil its Purpose," *International Settlement Canada, Research Resource Division for Refugees*, 7 (3): 1,4.
- Palmer, Howard
1982 *Patterns of Prejudice*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F.
1959 "Regional Differences in Anti-Negro Prejudice." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 59: 28-36.
1971 *Racially Separate or Together?* New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Reich, Carol and Mary Purbhoo
1975 "The Effects of Cross-Cultural Contact." *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science* 7 (4): 317-327.
- Ramcharan, Subhas
1982 *Racism: Nonwhites in Canada*. Toronto: Butterworths and Co. (Canada) Ltd.
- Satzewich, Vic (ed.)
1992 *Deconstructing a Nation: Immigration, Multiculturalism & Racism in '90s Canada*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Schissel, Bernard *et al.*

- 1989 "Social and Economic Context and Attitudes toward Immigrants in Canadian Cities." *International Migration Review* 23 (2): 289-307.

Sigelman, Lee and Susan Welch

- 1993 "The Contact Hypothesis Revisited: Black-White Interaction and Positive Racial Attitudes." *Social Forces* 71 (3): 781-795.

Simmons, Alan B.

- 1990 "'New Wave' Immigrants: Origins and Characteristics," in Shiva S. Halli *et al.* (Eds.), *Ethnic Demography: Canadian Immigrant, Racial and Cultural Variations*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Smith, Christopher B.

- 1994 "Back and to the Future: The Intergroup Contact Hypothesis Revisited." *Sociological Inquiry* 64 (4) 438-455.

Smitherman-Donaldson, Geneva and Teun A. van Dijk (eds.)

- 1988 *Discourse and Discrimination*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Stephan, Walter G. and Cookie W. Stephan

- 1984 "The Role of Ignorance in Intergroup Relations," in Norman Miller and Marilyn B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in Contact: The Psychology of Desegregation*. Orlando: Academic Press, Inc.

Stouffer, Samuel A. *et al.*

- 1949 *The American Soldier*, Volume I. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Taylor, K.W.

- 1991 "Racism in Canadian Immigration Policy." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 23 (1): 1-20.

Tienhaara, Nancy

- 1974 *Canadian Views on Immigration and Population: An Analysis of Post-War Gallup Polls*, Manpower and Immigration Canada, Canadian immigration and population study (Ottawa: Information Canada).

Troper, Harold

- 1993 "Canada's Immigration Policy Since 1945." *International Journal* 48 (2): 255-281.

van Dijk, Teun A.

- 1988 "How 'They' Hit the Headlines: Ethnic Minorities in the Press." in Geneva Smitherman-Donaldson and Teun A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse and Discrimination*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Whitaker, Reg

- 1991 *Canadian Immigration Policy Since Confederation*. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association.

White, Philip G. and James E. Curtis

- 1990 "Language regions and feelings toward outgroups: Analyses for 1968 and 1984." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 15 (4): 441-462.

Williams, Robin M. Jr.

- 1964 *Strangers Next Door: Ethnic Relations in American Communities*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Wilner, Daniel M. *et al.*

- 1952 "Residential Proximity and Intergroup Relations in Public Housing Projects." *The Journal of Social Issues* 8: 45-69.

Wright, Gerald C.

- 1976 "Community Structure and Voting in the South." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 40: 201-215.

Zajonc, Robert B.

- 1968 Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Monograph Supplement*, 9 (2: Part 2): 2-27.

Ziegler, Suzanne

- 1980 "Measuring Inter-Ethnic Attitudes in a Multi-Ethnic Context," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 7 (3): 45-55.

END

1 7 1 0 6 9 7

FIN