

**Perceived Discrimination Among Immigrants to Canada: Examining Some Socio-
demographic Factors**

Md. Aminul Islam

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
The University of Manitoba
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Masters of Arts

Department of Sociology and Criminology
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg

Copyright © 2018 by Md. Aminul Islam

Abstract

Using data from the General Social Survey (GSS) 2014 involving 7,090 immigrants, this study shows differences in perceptions of discrimination between racialized and non-racialized minority immigrants in Canada. The data from GSS 2014 show that about 19 percent of immigrants perceive discrimination in various situations. The study also reveals that about 23 percent of racialized minority immigrants experience discrimination in different situations, while only around 13 percent non-racialized minority immigrants face this situation. A logistic regression analysis is used to predict the probability of perceiving discrimination. Eight separate models - separate models for racialized and non-racialized minority immigrants, as well as African and Caribbean, South Asian, Chinese, Filipino/a, Latin American, and Middle Eastern immigrants - are developed for examining perceived discrimination among different groups of immigrants. Results show that racialized minority immigrants are more likely to perceive discrimination than their non-racialized minority counterparts. Non-racialized minority younger immigrants are more likely to perceive discrimination than their older immigrant counterparts. Sex only predicts perceived discrimination for non-racialized minority female immigrants, who are less likely to perceive discrimination than their white male counterparts. Results show that more highly racialized minority immigrants especially African and Caribbean and Latin American immigrants experience more discrimination than their less educated African and Caribbean and Latin American counterparts respectively.

Acknowledgement

A thesis of this nature cannot be done without assistance and support. My deepest appreciation and thanks go to my thesis supervisor Prof. Rick Linden for the relentless comments of my work, throughout this project. His cooperative, caring, and friendly personality helped me not to feel stressed while doing this thesis. Without his guidance and strong supervision, it would not have been possible for me to complete my thesis.

I would also like to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude to Prof. Lori Wilkinson for sharing her expertise in the field of immigration and for her work, helping me to finalize my regression analysis models. Her course in quantitative research methods helped to guide my analysis in the thesis. I would also like to thank Prof. Michael Baffoe, the external member of my thesis, for his comments on my work.

I must also thank Dr. Ian Clara, for helping me in accessing to Statistics Canada data through Manitoba Research Data Centre (RDC) at the University of Manitoba, and to his staff for their cordial assistance while accessing the data. This research was supported by funds to the Canadian Research Data Centre Network from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, and the Statistics Canada with a research project title, Aminul Islam 5558. I would also render my thanks to RDC for awarding me the Manitoba Research Data Centre Graduate Fellowship 2018.

I also would like to thank the Jagannath University, Dhaka, Bangladesh, for allowing me to pursue higher studies with a full paid study leave as per the university rules. I must also thank my sweet son and wife, especially to my sweet wife for her incessant encouragement and motivation as well as for allowing me the necessary time to finish the thesis.

I must also thank faculty members of the Department of Sociology and Criminology, administrative assistants and fellow students for their cooperation/assistance in various ways. I am deeply indebted to my parents, brothers, sister, many friends and relatives whose support in diverse ways has made it possible for me to reach this stage in my academic career. I would also like to acknowledge the International Graduate Entrance Scholarship from the University of Manitoba and the Department of Sociology for Sociology Graduate Student Entrance Scholarship that helped me completing my MA program.

Above all, I am very thankful to the Almighty Allah for providing me with knowledge, wisdom, good health and the strength to finish this thesis successfully.

Dedication

Dedicated to my late beloved mother, Monowara Begum, (I will forever miss you, *Ma*) and to my beloved father, Md. Abdul Aziz for their love, affection, care, protection and assistance they have shown me throughout my life and to my sweet son as well as to my wife for their sacrifice and assistance.

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
Abstract	i
Acknowledgement	ii
Dedication	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables.....	viii
Operational Definitions	x
Chapter One: Introduction	
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 The Focus of the Study	4
1.3 Research Questions.....	5
1.4 The Significance of the Study.....	6
1.5 Conclusion.....	6
Chapter Two: Literature Review	
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 Review of Literature	8
2.3 Discrimination.....	11
2.4 Language and discrimination.....	13
2.5 Discrimination in Service Delivery.....	14
2.6 Studies on Immigrants and Experience of Discrimination	15
2.7 Economists' Arguments Regarding Immigrants' Labour Market Outcomes.....	16
2.8 Sociologists' Arguments Regarding Immigrants' Labour Market Outcomes.....	18
2.9 Sense of Belonging and the Perception of Discrimination	21
2.10 Welcoming Community and Perceived Discrimination	22
2.11 Neighbourhood Characteristics and Perceived Discrimination.....	23
2.12 Concern for Personal Safety and Perceived Discrimination.....	23
2.13 Conclusion	24

Chapter Three: Source of Data and Methodology

3.1 Introduction.....	25
3.2 Source of Data.....	25
3.3 Description of Sampling and Sample.....	27
3.4 Methods Used in the Study.....	31
3.5 Conceptualization of Variables.....	33
3.5.1 Dependent Variable.....	33
3.5.2 Independent Variables.....	34
3.6 Analytical Procedures.....	42
3.7 Assumption Checking.....	43
3.8 Advantages and disadvantages of Using Secondary Data & Limitations of the Study.....	44
3.9 Ethical Considerations of the Study.....	44
3.10 Conclusion.....	45

Chapter Four: Results and Discussion

4.1 Results.....	46
4.1.1 Introduction.....	46
4.1.2 Results of the Univariate Analysis.....	46
4.1.3 Results of the Bivariate Analysis.....	47
4.1.3.1 Racialized Minority Status and Perceived Discrimination.....	47
4.1.3.2 Socio-demographic Variables and their Influence on Perceived Discrimination.....	50
4.1.3.3 The Influence of Other Independent Variables on Perceived Discrimination.....	51
4.1.4 Results of the Multivariate Analyses.....	56
4.1.4.1 Racialized and Non-racialized Minority Immigrant Models Results.....	57
4.1.4.2 Is Perceived Discrimination Different for Various Racialized Groups of Immigrants?	62
4.2 Discussion	70

4.3 Conclusion.....78

Chapter Five: Conclusion and Contribution to the Knowledge of Discrimination against Immigrants

5.1 Conclusion.....79

5.2 Contribution of the Study to Our Knowledge of Discrimination against Immigrants.....80

5.3 Future Research.....81

References.....82

Appendix 1 Correlation matrix between Dependent and Predictor Variables.....101

Appendix 2 Items Included in Index of Global Discrimination and Disruptive Neighbours’ Behavioural Pattern Index106

Appendix 3 Questionnaire Used in GSS 2014 to Collect Data.....107

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Number Distribution of Permanent Residents to Canada by Category (2011 - 2017).....	3
Table 3.1 Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Study Population.....	29
Table 3.2 Items used in the Global Discrimination Index (GDI).....	34
Table 3.3 Items included in Disruptive Neighbours' Behaviour Index (DNBI).....	38
Table 3.4 Operationalization of Dependent and Independent Variables.....	40
Table 4.1 Percentage of Immigrants' Experience/Perception of Discrimination.....	46
Table 4.2 Immigrants' Experience of Discrimination in Some Situations and due to Race, Ethnicity, and Language.....	48
Table 4.3 Percentage of Immigrants' Experience of Discrimination by Number of Incidences/Situations.....	48
Table 4.4 Cross-tabulation and Chi-Square test of Significance for Perceived Discrimination and Racialized Minority Status of Immigrants.....	49
Table 4.5 Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square test of Significance for Discrimination Perceived by Immigrants and Different Age Groups of Immigrants.....	50
Table 4.6 Cross-tabulation and Chi-Square Test of Significance for Perceived Discrimination and Employment Status.....	53
Table 4.7 Cross-tabulation and Chi-Square Test of Significance for Perceived Discrimination with Disruptive Neighbours' BehaviouralPattern.....	53
Table 4.8 Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square test of Significance for Perceived Discrimination with Neighbourhood Crime Increasing or Decreasing Trend.....	54
Table 4.9 Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square test of Significance for Perceived Discrimination with Living in a Welcoming Community.....	54
Table 4.10 Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square test of Significance for Perceived Discrimination with Sense of Belonging to Local Community.....	55
Table 4.11 Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square test of Significance for perceived Discrimination with Concern for Personal Safety from Crime.....	55
Table 4.12 Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square test of Significance for perceived Discrimination with Protective Actions Taken out of Fear of Crime in the last 12 Months.....	56

Table 4.13 Odds Ratios of Predictor Variables on Perceived Discrimination of Immigrants...	61
Table 4.14 Odds Ratios of Predictor Variables on Perceived Discrimination of Immigrants i.e. Middle Eastern, South Asian, and African and Caribbean Immigrants.....	67
Table 4.15 Odds Ratios of Predictor Variables on Perceived Discrimination of Immigrants i.e. Latin American, Filipino/a, and Chinese Immigrants.....	68
Table A.1 Correlations between Dependent and Predictor Variables.....	101
Table A.2 Items included in Indices of Global Discrimination and Disruptive Neighbours' Behavioural Pattern	106

Operational Definitions

These conceptual definitions were used for doing this study.

Immigrant: An immigrant is people who is born outside Canada, but holds citizenship status other than Canadian and has shifted himself/herself here in Canada from his/her own country of birth.

Discrimination: Discrimination, in the present study, "means treating people differently, negatively or adversely because of their race, age, religion, sex, etc." (Statistics Canada, 2017: 182).

Visible minority: Visible minority, in this study, refers to the category of immigrants who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour (Statistics Canada, 2017). According to Canadian Employment Equity Act (1995), visible minority is a person/immigrant who is other than Aboriginal peoples, but non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour. The visible minority immigrants belong to either South Asian, Chinese, African and Caribbean, Filipino/a, Latin American, Middle Eastern, Southeast Asian, West Asian, Korean, or Japanese groups (Statistics Canada, 2015).

Recent Immigrant: Recent immigrant means, in this study, that the immigrants who came here in Canada first in the last ten years i.e. 2005 to 2014 to live permanently.

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

Discrimination against immigrants is an important issue for Canada as it is a large country but lacks the population to meet labour market demands. Although immigrants help to fill the shortage of skilled labour, they also play a positive role in the growth of GDP, aggregate demand, investment, productivity, and taxes (Dungan, Fang, & Gunderson, 2013), but they experience various kinds of discrimination after entering Canada.

Canada has a policy of accepting skilled immigrants from all over the world. Since Canada used to accept immigrants only from Caucasian nations before the 1960s, there was less racial diversity among the population. But after changing the discriminatory immigrant selection policy in the 1960s and introducing a points-based selection system in 1967, racially diverse immigrants got an opportunity to enter into Canada without barriers (Raza et al. 2013). According to 2001 census, of those entering into Canada in the 1960s or before, only 10.2 percent of immigrants were racially diverse. However, the proportion of racially diverse immigrants increased to 51.8 percent in the 1970s, 65.4 percent in the 1980s, and about 75 percent in the 1990s (Reitz & Banerjee, 2007). The 2006 census shows that almost 80 percent of recent immigrants have come from the new source (i.e. developing) countries. Ninety-nine percent of immigrants from non-Caucasian nations are racialized minorities (Aboubacar & Zhu, 2013). The 2016 census shows that 7.7 million Canadians are racialized minorities. They represent 22.3 percent of the population and it is expected that racialized minority immigrants' representation will be 34.4 percent by 2036 (Statistics Canada, 2017).

The 2016 census also shows that immigrants made up 21.9 percent of Canada's total population (Statistics Canada, 2017). Most immigrants enter with high expectations as Canada is a developed country where the living standard is high, health and education systems are good, social security is praiseworthy and politics are stable (Nangia, 2013). However, some immigrants face discrimination after landing because of ethnicity, race, language, content of birth, and religion (Nangia, 2013). The General Social Survey 2009 shows that one-fifth of landed immigrants reported experiencing some sort of discrimination in Canada because of one or more of these characteristics (Nangia, 2013).

Discrimination "means treating people differently, negatively or adversely because of their race, age, religion, sex, etc." (Statistics Canada, 2017, 182). In Canada, the major shift to new source countries after the removal of discrimination from immigration policies altered the racial, cultural, and language composition of later immigration cohorts (Phythian et al., 2010). According to Phythian and her colleagues (2010), this trend raises a question about the ability of new immigrants to Canada to integrate socially and economically. Research shows that recent immigrants have not experienced the same reception as earlier cohorts; rather, recent immigrants to Canada have experienced a number of obstacles to success, including a lack of recognition of foreign credentials, declining at-entry income, and higher rates of unemployment and poverty (Picot and Sweetman, 2005). The earnings of racialized immigrants started declining in the 1960s when Canadian immigration policy was changed to allow more immigrants from non-traditional source countries (Phythian et al., 2010). Although the proportion of racialized people is increasing dramatically in Canada, the earnings of racialized immigrants are not converging with the earnings of native-born Canadians over time. Rather, the earnings gap first widened in the 1990s and remains large. Statistics Canada data show that between 1981 and 2006, the earnings

gap between recent immigrants, especially racialized immigrants, and their Canadian-born counterparts widened significantly (Pendakur & Pendakur, 2010; Raza et al. 2013; Jedwab & Satzewich, 2015).

About 60 percent of immigrants are economic class, and the remaining 40 percent are refugee and/or family class. Economic class immigrants are selected on the basis of a points-based system that includes criteria such as age, educational qualifications, job experience, and language ability.

Table 1 Number distribution of permanent residents to Canada by Category (2011 - 2017)

Categories	Years						
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Economic	156,120 (62.77%)	160,790 (62.37%)	148,254 (57.23%)	165,188 (63.47%)	170,398 (62.68%)	156,020 (52.63%)	159,240 (55.60%)
Sponsored Family	61,344 (24.66%)	69,870 (27.10%)	83,379 (32.19%)	67,647 (25.99%)	65,490 (24.09%)	78,010 (26.32%)	82,470 (28.80%)
Resettled Refugee & Protected Person in Canada	27,876 (11.21%)	23,095 (8.96%)	24,139 (9.32%)	24,070 (9.25%)	32,115 (11.81%)	58,915 (19.87%)	41,410 (14.40%)
All Other Immigration	3,392 (1.36%)	4,054 (1.57%)	3,267 (1.26%)	3,377 (1.30%)	3,844 (1.41%)	3,490 (1.18%)	3,260 (1.14%)
Total	248,732 (100%)	257,809 (100%)	259,039 (100%)	260,282 (100%)	271,847 (100%)	296,435 (100%)	286,380 (100%)

Source: Permanent Residents - Monthly IRCC Updates, February 28, 2018, calculation by author

Table 1 shows that the economic class makes up the majority of immigrants to Canada. Approximately two-thirds (62.8%) of immigrants were economic class in 2011, but the percentage was reduced to 55.6% in 2017, largely due to the arrival of over 50,000 refugees that year (Permanent Residents - Monthly IRCC Update, 2018).

Recent research has shown that the economic outcomes of recently arrived immigrants and refugees have been lower than previous cohorts and that racialized immigrants fare much worse. Reitz and Banerjee (2007) found that racialized group members had much lower relative household earnings and higher poverty rates than their European white counterparts. They also

show that some racialized immigrants are more likely to become victims of hate crimes because of their race or ethnicity (Reitz and Bannerji, 2007). Their findings are confirmed by Blank and his colleagues (2004) who found that some immigrants from racialized groups faced racial discrimination. Brettell (2011) showed that racialized immigrants not only experienced discrimination due to phenotypical racial characteristics, but also because of language abilities, class position in the society, immigration status, and foreignness. These types of discrimination are still being experienced by immigrants today, especially racialized persons, partly because of other factors such as age, gender, education, and continent of birth. As a result, perceived discrimination against immigrants is an important topic to study.

1.2 The Focus of the Study

Most of the studies regarding immigrants' perception of discrimination have focused on employment discrimination or on the wage gaps between immigrants and other Canadians or immigrants from Caucasian nations, and little attention has been paid to the degree of immigrants' perceived discrimination in a broader sense. The purpose of this thesis is to fill this gap and to study immigrants' perceived discrimination by examining socio-demographic factors that affect the degree of perceived discrimination among immigrants', with a particular focus on racialized immigrants. Racialized immigrants face situations/treatments unusual to them, some of which might be discriminatory. In this respect, the study focuses on whether immigrants' sex, age, educational qualifications, race/ethnicity, continent of birth, number of years living in Canada, and household languages as well as some other independent variables play an important role in creating a discriminatory situation for immigrants especially racialized immigrants to Canada. Studies on perceived discrimination against immigrants in a broader sense, based on the

most recent data, are rare and have not focused on how socio-demographic factors may influence different racialized groups of immigrants in ways different than they affect white immigrants. This thesis will contribute to our understanding of perceived discrimination among immigrants, with a particular focus on racialized immigrants to Canada.

1.3 Research Questions

Many studies have examined the negative labour market outcomes or income gaps between racialized immigrants and non-racialized immigrants or white Canadians, but few studies have focused on discrimination, in a broader sense, which makes the immigrants, especially those from racialized groups, disadvantaged in many aspects of their lives. My thesis attempts to address this gap and focuses on two questions: 1) Is there discrimination against immigrants to Canada? 2) If there is discrimination, what socio-demographic factors play a significant role in creating this situation for immigrants to Canada? The study examines three sub-questions: a) Are some groups of immigrants more likely to perceive discrimination than others? b) How do age, sex, language skills, levels of education, continent of birth (geographical macro region), and number of years living in Canada effect immigrants' perception of discrimination? c) How do neighbourhood crime, disruptive neighbours' behavioural patterns, concern for personal safety from crime, protective actions taken out of fear of crime, welcoming community, and sense of belonging to community influence on perceived discrimination? The exploration of these aspects can help us to understand the extent of discrimination against immigrants, especially racialized immigrants, to Canada.

1.4 The Significance of the Study

This thesis uses recent national data to examine an important question regarding discrimination in Canada. The main question is whether immigrants, especially racialized immigrants, perceive any kind of discrimination in Canada? Furthermore, it also contributes to the knowledge of discrimination that immigrants face in Canada as the study uses nationally representative data to examine the experience of perceived discrimination in a broader sense. The study will help to identifying if some groups of racialized immigrants are more likely to perceive discrimination than other groups as the study includes six racialized groups of immigrants in the analysis.

The study offers quantitative evidence regarding the challenges immigrants, especially racialized immigrants, encounter in the process of settling in Canada. As there is a lack of quantitative academic research in examining perceived discrimination among immigrants to Canada, this research provides a basis for creating an understanding of immigrants' perceptions of discrimination as well as for helping to decrease discrimination against immigrants, especially racialized immigrants.

1.5 Conclusion

This chapter provides the background of the thesis. The study will help us to understand the extent of perceived discrimination among immigrants, especially among racialized immigrants to Canada. Since immigrants want to find a job in line with their expertise and their educational qualifications and try to settle successfully in the Canadian society, it is important to know whether they enjoy the opportunities equally or experience any kinds of discrimination.

The thesis is organized into five chapters. The introductory chapter provides background information about the study and discusses the core focus of the study, specific research questions, and the significance of the study. The second chapter discusses the literature review which examines the relationship between racialized minority status of immigrants and perceived discrimination against immigrants. The third chapter includes information about the sources of data along with demographic information about the study population, methodology used in the analysis, and limitations of the study. Chapter four includes the results and discussions of the study. The last chapter includes the conclusion and discusses the contribution to the research on discrimination against immigrants. Suggestions for future research are also discussed in the last chapter.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

Discrimination against immigrants remains prevalent in Canada despite its many laws and norms against such behavior. The uninformed perception is that immigrants take jobs away from Canadians and this fuels racism and discrimination against newcomers. Factually, immigration is one of the most important factors in continuing the supply of skilled workers from around the world and helps to keep the Canadian economy operating and growing. A large number of immigrants come to Canada every year as it is seen as a very welcoming country for many immigrants due to its multiculturalism, congenial political system, well-organized social welfare systems, openness to diversity as well as universal health and education systems (Statistics Canada, 2013). Nonetheless, a disproportionate percentage of immigrants, especially racialized immigrants, face various kinds of discrimination after entering Canada. Along with racialized group status, some other socio-demographic factors, for example, age, sex, educational qualifications, the origin of birthplace, stay in Canada, and household languages may result in unequal opportunities and foster discrimination against them. This chapter reviews the literature related to discrimination against immigrants, especially racialized groups of immigrants as a way of setting the context for understanding the results of the regression analyses.

2.2 Review of Literature

This section reviews the literature related to the experience of perceived discrimination of immigrants to Canada. Generally, discrimination refers to a behavior that excludes all members or some members of a particular group from certain rights, opportunities, or privileges (Schaefer,

2015). According to Brym et al. (2013), discrimination refers to an unfair treatment faced by the people who are deprived of equal rights due to their group membership. Discrimination can range from sub-conscious and conscious interpersonal interactions between individuals to more institutionally structured, systemic practices (Edge & Newbold, 2013).

Discrimination is a process that produces as well as reinforces oppressive situations that marginalize, and/or restrain the lives of those being discriminated against (Edge & Newbold, 2013). Discrimination denotes treating particular types or class of people differently because of their physical, social, or economic conditions and thereby putting them at a disadvantage (Nangia, 2013).

Jackson et al. (1998, 194) define perceived racial discrimination as " a minority group members' subjective perception of unfair treatment of racial/ethnic groups or members of the groups, based on racial prejudice and ethnocentrism, which may be manifest at individual, cultural, or institutional levels." It can take many forms. Discrimination can be conscious or unconscious, intentional or unintentional. Moreover, discrimination can occur at different levels such as cultural, institutional, interpersonal, and individual (Harrell & Sloan-Pena, 2006). Furthermore, discrimination can occur in the labor market, the education system, the health care system, the criminal justice system, or in the housing market (Blank et al., 2004).

This study examines the perceived/conscious and institutional forms of discrimination among immigrants to Canada. Although immigrants, especially racialized persons, perceive discrimination in different domains, most of the previous research has focused on immigrant people's labour market outcomes or discrimination in the work environment including issues like wage gaps between blacks and whites (Pendakur & Pendakur, 2010), highly educated

immigrants working in lower-skilled jobs than their similarly educated white counterparts (Gilmore and Gilmore, 2009) and discrimination against non-English sounding names (Oreopoulos, 2009). In spite of the dependence of the Canadian economy on immigrants for the growth of the labour market, positive impact on GDP, productivity, and taxes, Canadian society or economy discriminates immigrants in many ways (Dungan et al. 2013).

Although Canada is a multicultural country and has a very positive policy towards immigration and many programs for the settlement, integration, and inclusion of new immigrants (Biles, 2008; Nangia, 2012), racialized immigrants remain in a disadvantaged position. For example, some have problems finding employment because of the devaluation of foreign qualifications (Statistics Canada, 2005; Buzdugan & Halli, 2009), and racial discrimination because of being a member of a particular racial group (Harrell & Sloan-Pena, 2006; Buzdugan & Halli, 2009). The points system of selecting skilled immigrants in Canada, which was enacted in 1967 and was formally enshrined by the new Immigration Act in 1976, gave immigrants of all ethnic groups an equal chance to be selected (Abu-Laban & Gabriel, 2002). However, some immigrants do not have an equal opportunity to be employed in Canada (Abu-Laban & Gabriel, 2002).

Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2006) data also show that although 60 percent of recent immigrants to Canada have been admitted in the "economic class," - selected on skills-based criteria - many of the immigrants' skills are not recognized and, hence, their integration into the Canadian labour market is slow and unsatisfactory (Esses et al., 2007).

The majority of instances of discrimination involve negative treatment by employers and by the general public (e.g., McGinnity et al., 2006). Moreover, modern labour markets are highly competitive in general and even more so for immigrants (Borjas, 1987), who must adapt to a new

socioeconomic environment. Although Canada's immigrant selection policies increasingly emphasize labour market criteria, new immigrants have fallen behind economically. From the 1970s onwards, the average employment earnings of immigrants - even economic class immigrants - have declined steadily compared to those of Canadian-born workers (Picot, 2008; Kustec, 2012). The reasons for the decline are not entirely clear, but sociologists argue that most immigrants earn less or are employed in low-wage occupations because of discrimination on the part of the native citizens of receiving countries, low skills and lack of language proficiency (Clark, 2014; Phythian et al. 2010; Buzdugan & Halli, 2009). Economists argue that the major reason why immigrants' income is lower than that of native-born members of racialized groups, white immigrants and white native-born Canadians is that more recent immigrants are less qualified than previous cohorts, i.e. before the 1960s, (Warman et al., 2015; Sweetman et al., 2015; Pendakur & Pendakur, 2010). The study's main focus is to examine immigrants' perceived discrimination in a broader sense and includes measures from inside and outside the labour market.

2.3 Discrimination

Categorization of human beings based on race is not scientific because it is proven that our ancestry all originates in one place, Africa (Cavalli-Sforza, Menozzi, and Piazza, 1994). As early as the 1950s, scientists have agreed that the human race consists of one race, not multiple races based on skin colour. Sadly, despite these efforts, race remains socially 'real'. Gfellner (2015: 40) defines race as "a socially constructed characterization of people based on shared phenotypic characteristics such as skin color and facial features" and that's why we continue to see the inequalities in all parts of life here in Canada. Racism is defined as unfavorable or hostile treatment of "individuals or groups based on perceived 'racial' and cultural differences"

(Harman, 2010, 177). Racism is most commonly understood as an 'attempt to fix human social groups in terms of natural properties of belonging within particular political and geographical contexts' (Harman, 2010, 27). Ethnicity is the primary marker for cultural, linguistic and religious differences between groups of people.

Despite the fact that race is socially constructed and not scientifically real, racism remains a significant problem in Canada. Kobayashi and Johnson (2007) say that although polls show that Canadians are very tolerant people who see multiculturalism positively, those same polls show that about one in five Canadians has discriminatory attitudes towards racialized immigrants. Today, there is a recognition, even among most white Canadians, that racism is a major problem in today's society. An Ipsos poll that conducted on behalf of Global News found that, among more than 1,000 Canadians surveyed, 48 percent of respondents opine that Canada has a racism problem (Abedi, 2017).

Oxman-Martinez and her colleagues (2012) examined newcomer immigrant children's perceptions of ethnic discrimination and social exclusion in Canada and found that about one-fourth of the children of racialized immigrants experienced discrimination by their peers at school or outside of school during the last month due to their having a different ethnic identity than their white counterparts. This peer discrimination involved direct forms of hostile behaviors such as hitting, name-calling, pushing, being insulted in front of other students, and threatening as well as indirect forms of discrimination, for example, ignoring and excluding them in social gatherings (Oxman-Martinez et al., 2012). The researchers concluded that this perceived ethnic discrimination by peers and teachers are negatively associated with children's sense of social competence in peer relationships. Moreover, children's self-esteem and sense of academic

excellence are also negatively associated with perceived ethnic discrimination by teachers (Oxman-Martinez et al., 2012).

Dion and Kawakami (1996) found that Africans and Caribbeans in Toronto are the most likely to perceive discrimination followed by Chinese and South Asian peoples. Ray and Preston (2009), using data from the 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey, showed that 22 percent of all residents in Toronto reported the experience of perceived discrimination, with substantially higher rates for Africans and Caribbeans and East and South Asian groups at 55 percent and 35 percent respectively. Ray and Preston (2009), furthermore, showed that racial discrimination among racialized groups in Toronto is reported to be experienced most often and at higher rates than their non-racialized immigrants from France, Britain, America, New Zealand, and Australia, and white Canadian counterparts. Results of regression analysis demonstrate that compared to white people, Africans and Caribbeans are 20.6 times more likely to report racial discrimination while the rate for East and South Asians is 4.5 times higher than their white counterparts (Ray & Preston, 2009). An analysis of the GSS 2009 data also reveals that, in general, men are less likely to experience discrimination than women (Nangia, 2013).

2.4 Language and Discrimination

There is much less research conducted on the influence of language knowledge and accent on perceptions of discrimination among Canadians. Turchick Hakak and her colleagues (2010), in a qualitative study of Latin American immigrant professionals, show that among 20 participants, 65 percent identify their lack of fluency in English language as one of the major challenges with respect to be successful in job interviews and also to get promoted on time within companies or organizations although all respondents have been living in Canada for at

least two years and have completed a demanding post-secondary degree. Preston and her colleagues (2011) show that among all immigrants with either high school or less education or postsecondary education, immigrants who are capable of speaking English or French fluently are more likely to report workplace discrimination than their immigrant counterparts whose language skills are weak. This is likely due to their ability to better voice their concerns, but also due to number of years living in Canada. Researchers believe that as time in Canada increases, so does the propensity to be exposed to discriminatory acts (Reitz and Banerjee, 2007).

2.5 Discrimination in Service Delivery

Generally, customer discrimination is defined as "differential treatment of customers in the marketplace based on perceived group-level traits that produce outcomes favorable to 'in-groups' and unfavorable to 'out-groups'" (Crockett, Grier, & Williams, 2003, 1). Klinner and Walsh (2013) examined customer perceptions of discrimination in service delivery. They reviewed many studies that still identify discrimination in various service contexts such as car purchases (e.g., Ayres & Siegelman, 1995), real estate (e.g., Yinger, 1995), insurance and other financial services (e.g., Turner & Skidmore, 1999), health care (e.g., Schulman et al., 1999), restaurants (Rosenbaum & Montoya, 2007), and soliciting taxi services (e.g., Ridley, Bayton, & Hamilton Outtz, 1989). Klinner and Walsh (2013) said that these studies not only revealed the presence of discrimination but also showed the degree to which membership in disadvantaged, racialized/stigmatized groups unfairly obstructs many areas of social and commercial life. They also reviewed the work of Harris et al. (2005) who identified three sorts of discrimination that depict ethnic consumers' experiences in service institutions: a) the form of perceived discrimination, b) the level of service, and c) discrimination through criminal suspicion. Among

these, the form of perceived discrimination and level of service likely affect most stigmatized/racialized group members (Klinner & Walsh, 2013). They have reviewed some other studies that identify three alternative types of discrimination: a) critical observation and gaze, b) verbal prejudicial statements, and c) poor service. Among these, poor service indicates a customer from a stigmatized/racialized group receives a lower quality of service than a customer from a non-stigmatized/non-racialized group (Klinner & Walsh, 2013). Their literature review is supported by the findings of group discussion and depth interviews with thirty consumers from racialized groups. Informants reported on experiences of perceived discrimination with service deliverers and positive and negative events.

2.6 Studies on Immigrants and Experience of Discrimination

Berry & Hou (2017), using the data from GSS 2013, show that 41.8 percent of immigrants reported experiencing discrimination. They found that the experience of discrimination varies depending on whether they are integrated, assimilated, marginalized or segregated, the four conditions of Berry's Acculturation Model (Berry & Hou, 2017). Their findings show that the experience of discrimination is significantly associated with the immigrants who belong to the segregated group (Berry & Hou, 2017). Badets and her colleagues (2003) use the data from the Ethnic Diversity Survey and find that Africans and Caribbeans, South Asians, and Chinese immigrants are the most likely to experience discrimination.

In a qualitative study among Latin American immigrant professionals in Canada, Turchick Hakak and her colleagues (2010) also identify discrimination as a significant factor in the experiences of immigrants. Turchick Hakak and her colleagues (2010) They reviewed previous research and found that many researchers have identified blatant and subtle prejudices

as sources of discrimination against immigrants (Brief et al., 2000; Esses et al., 2006; Petersen and Dietz, 2005). Moreover, as prejudice and explicitly discriminatory behaviours are discouraged in the present world, especially in the western societies (Brief et al., 2000), many people who have prejudiced ideas against immigrants continue practicing discriminatory behavior, but they present logical justifications for their discriminatory behaviours (Esses et al., 2006).

Some early studies have also found that white Canadians are likely to feel uncomfortable around racialized groups of immigrants of non-European origin and to show a preference for people of their own colour (Berry & Kalin, 1995). This kind of attitude towards racialized groups of immigrants can lead to discrimination in various social institutions (Ziegert & Hanges, 2005).

2.7 Economists' Arguments Regarding Immigrants' Labour Market Outcomes

Warman, Sweetman, and Goldmann (2015) say that relative to their native-born counterparts, the recent pool of immigrants who have been admitted to Canada, United States, and European countries have experienced generally deteriorating labour market outcomes over the last few decades. They show that for both male and female immigrants, only those who have been able to match their jobs with education or have strong English proficiency receive a positive return to their schooling otherwise immigrants, especially newly arrived individuals, receive a lower rate of return than native-born whites (Warman, Sweetman & Goldmann, 2015). Sweetman, McDonald, and Hawthorne (2015) also demonstrate that immigrants receive relatively lower rates of return in Canadian labour markets for educational qualifications obtained in developing countries. Picot (2008); Hawthorne (2008); Picot & Sweetman (2011); Bonikowska, Hou & Picot (2011) have also shown that immigrants' labour market earnings have

significantly declined in recent times, especially from the 1990s and onwards, in spite of their higher level of education compared to their Canadian-born counterparts, controlling for ethnicity or country of origin. Picot & Sweetman (2011) show that changing source countries of immigrants, declining returns for foreign experience, education quality, as well as economic recessions have all had negative consequences on the smooth economic integration of immigrants to Canadian society. Despite the significant improvement in young immigrants' educational qualifications with their corresponding employment in professional occupations, Uppal and LaRochelle-Cote (2014) show that 43% of women and 35% of men who graduated from universities other than those in Canada or the United States are overqualified for their jobs as they work in such occupations that require lower level of education.

Palameta (2007) also found an earnings gap between Canadian-born racialized groups and their white counterparts. According to Pendakur and Pendakur (2010), in spite of the increasing 'home-grown' racialized minority populations in Canada, earnings gaps between white and racialized workers, which first widened in the 1990s, remain large, because of racial discrimination in the labour market. Moreover, Pendakur and Pendakur (2010, 321), analyzing census data of 1996, 2001, and 2006, show that "with few exceptions, there has been a real deterioration in the prospects for visible minority men over the three census periods."

Economic discrimination is not limited to income among immigrants. Oreopoulos's (2009) study reveals evidence of discrimination in being selected for a job interview because of a name (English-sounding or not) and location of experience (foreign/local). Oreopoulos (2009) found that resumes with English sounding names are 39 percent more likely to receive requests for interviews from Canadian employers than resumes with Indian, Pakistani, or Chinese names.

Other important factors that play an important role in discriminating against immigrants in some way include country of birth/origin (Owusu & Sweetman, 2015; Jantzen, 2015), educational attainment (Picot & Sweetman, 2011; Bonikowska, Hou & Picot, 2011; Picot, 2008), racialized minority status, gender, age (Warman, Sweetman & Goldman, 2015; Jantzen, 2015; Pendakur & Pendakur, 2010; Houle & Yssaad, 2010; Oreopoulou, 2011); and proficiency in English or French (Zietsma, 2010; Hosoda & Stone-Romero, 2010) among others.

2.8 Sociologists' Arguments Regarding Immigrants' Labour Market Outcomes

The sociological research on the various aspects of economic discrimination experienced by racialized immigrants finds similar patterns. More recently arrived immigrants do experience lower income, less education-job fit and are less likely to be selected for jobs, but they have a different explanation for why this happens. The economists tend to blame inferior education attained overseas as the main driver behind lower economic outcomes. Sociologists, on the other hand, have evidence that the structure of business and economy are largely to blame. Buzdugan and Halli (2009) show that a higher number racialized immigrants is employed in labour markets characterized by unstable and short-term jobs, poor working conditions and low pay because they are 'shut out' of the better paying jobs. When immigrants themselves are compared, Buzdugan and Halli (2009) find that racialized groups earn lower wages than their white immigrant counterparts, pointing to a structural basis of discrimination. The problem with economic research is that none of the data allows them to examine the quality of individual schools. Instead, they assume all schools from a particular country are either superior or inferior. We know this is not the case. Every country has excellent schools in addition to poor schools, even in Canada. By not controlling for individual school quality, these researchers are

contributing to the unfair characterization and stereotyping of non-industrialized schools as being inferior.

Buzdugan (2006) reported that female immigrants earn significantly less than their male counterparts. This is one of the most consistent findings in analyses of income regardless of immigrant status. Li (2000) found an interaction between gender and immigrant status. In order to explain the interaction, some researchers have done separate analyses for males and females and demonstrate that gender has an effect on immigrants' income (Li 2003, 2001, 2000). In addition, these researchers have found that being an immigrant and a woman leads to a double penalty on income (Buzdugan, 2006). Immigrant women earn less than native-born men or women as well as immigrant males (Li, 2000). According to Statistics Canada (2008), the overall unemployment rate for immigrant women is 4 percent higher than their male counterparts.

Buzdugan and Halli (2009) found that foreign education of immigrants is less valued than Canadian or Western and Northern European education and also reported that this discrimination is greater for racialized groups of immigrants who come from developing countries. Moreover, the Canadian labour market often does not recognize immigrants' foreign work experience, especially the experiences of immigrants from developing countries, until these countries' immigrants obtain Canadian degree/diploma or training (Buzdugan & Halli, 2009). Yoshida and Smith (2008) also show that racialized male immigrants earn less than their native-born white male counterparts and other non-racialized immigrants. The main causes of this type of discrimination against male members of racialized immigrants originate in lower returns for their foreign experience and education (Yoshida & Smith, 2008). They show that the value of foreign experience on income is nearly zero and that a foreign degree from developing countries receives a lower premium than Canadian-earned degrees (Yoshida & Smith, 2008). Yoshida and Smith's

(2008) findings regarding devaluation of foreign degrees are consistent with the findings of Buzdugan and Halli (2009) and many others.

Phythian and her colleagues (2010) find similar reasons why discrimination has a negative influence on the economic outcomes of new immigrants to Canada. They observe that racial diversity in Canada has increased, and this has brought increased levels of income inequality (Phythian et al., 2010). Moreover, they show that race has a significant effect on immigrants' labour market incomes (Phythian et al., 2010). These findings infer that racial discrimination is structurally embedded within the Canadian labour market. Similarly, Reitz (2007) uses Statistics Canada's landmark Ethnic Diversity Survey (2002) data and finds that the proportion of respondents who reported experiencing discrimination was higher for African or Caribbean immigrants to Canada and higher also for the second generation of people of African or Caribbean backgrounds born in Canada than for white immigrants as well as for the Canadian-born children of white immigrants (Reitz, 2007).

Results from the GSS 2009 show that 62 percent of immigrants reported having experienced some form of discrimination compared to 53 percent of all non-immigrant Canadians, while 56 percent of immigrants reported experiencing discrimination at work or when applying for a job or promotion compared to 44 percent of all non-immigrant Canadians (Nangia, 2013). Moreover, GSS 2009 data show that about 35 percent of immigrants have experienced discrimination in a store, bank, or restaurant in Canada (Nangia, 2013). The univariate analysis of GSS 2009 data clearly indicates that the greatest variations in the experiences of discrimination between immigrants and non-immigrant Canadians are due to immigrants' race, ethnicity, and language (Nangia, 2013). However, Nangia's (2013) logistic regression analysis of the GSS data 2009 shows that only age and racialized minority status have

a significant effect on experiences of discrimination. Younger immigrants (< 35 years) are more likely to experience discrimination than older immigrants (65+ years) (Nangia, 2013). This might be attributed to young people's greater exposure to the outside world because of their participation in education, employment, sports, and other different social activities (Nangia, 2013). Moreover, she shows that racialized immigrants are more likely to face discrimination than non-racialized immigrants (odds ratio of 2.1) (Nangia, 2013).

The reviews of both economic and social analyses of immigrants' labour market outcomes and employment discrimination suggest that negative labour market outcomes are caused not only by poor human capital of immigrants but also by other factors such as labour market discrimination, which might also negatively affect earnings and employment discrimination, though this issue is the subject of much debate.

2.9 Sense of Belonging and the Perception of Discrimination

Sense of belonging is an important notion that is entangled with quality of life, consisting of a feeling that individuals/immigrants matter to one another and to a group, community, or society. Maslow (1954) identified sense of belonging as a basic human need. Hagerty and his colleagues (1992, 173) defined sense of belonging as “the experience of personal involvement in a system or environment so that persons feel themselves to be an integral part of that system or environment.” An immigrant's sense of belonging is an indication of integration into the mainstream society, social interactions, and institutions, and it nurtures feelings of social solidarity with the predominant group of society (Schellenberg, 2004). Chow (2007) also shows that a sense of belonging is a powerful source of well-being for immigrants, and at the same time it is also manifested in the form of their long-term commitment to Canada. Other Canadian

studies have shown that sense of belonging to local community and the perception of discrimination among immigrants are related. For example, Reitz and Banerjee (2007) show that perception/experience of discrimination, as well as the loose of ties with family members during immigration, decrease sense of belonging to Canada. Sonn (2002) found that immigrants may feel that they are not a part of the host society. This may lead them to perceive discrimination which may delay their socio-cultural integration to Canadian society. Similarly, Huot and his associates (2014) also express the view that the stronger or weaker sense of belonging plays a crucial role in determining the level of perceived discrimination and feelings of exclusion.

2.10 Welcoming Community and Perceived Discrimination

Receiving communities play a very important role in determining whether immigrants, especially racialized immigrants, will become well-adapted members of the host community or whether they will remain disadvantaged. The welcoming nature of a host community is largely responsible for facilitating multiculturalism, encouraging full participation of immigrants and resolving conflicts within the various groups, communities and societies. If the community is less friendly and less welcoming, immigrants, especially racialized immigrants, may perceive more discrimination. Reitz and Banerjee (2007) found that if immigrants feel excluded or receive less friendly/less welcoming treatment from the society, they may perceive discrimination. They further show that feeling of discomfort about the host society is tantamount to the perception of exclusion or marginalization or discrimination as this situation obstructs immigrants from feeling comfortable social and civic participation.

2.11 Neighbourhood Characteristics and Perceived Discrimination

The overall characteristics of neighbourhoods play a significant role in integrating immigrants in the mainstream of Canadian society as well as helping to determine the degree of perceived discrimination among immigrants to Canada. Sampson and his associates (2002) show that the characteristics of a neighbourhood structure influence the life chances of the residents of that area, irrespective of different types of socio-economic statuses among the inhabitants. Teixeira's (2006) study of the housing experiences of Angolan and Mozambican immigrants in Toronto's rental market shows that Mozambican immigrants had less positive views of their neighbourhood as a community than their Angolan immigrant counterparts. Almost a third of both groups reported that they do not view their present residence as home because of the lack of privacy, the lower standard of living, or anxiety about neighbours and landlords (Teixeira, 2006). Wu and his colleagues (2012, 388) show that "the concentration of immigrants in poor neighbourhoods could have serious consequences for their integration." Massey (1990) and Sampson and his associates (2002) concluded that it is not uncommon to see the breakdown of social interactions or cohesion and social institutions in poor neighbourhoods. This breakdown, along with a lack of occupational training or educational and employment facilities, can have negative impact on immigrants' lives in Canada (Wu et al., 2002). As a result, the amount of crime in poor neighbourhoods may increase or might be more problematic and that's why immigrants who face this kind of situation might be more likely to perceive discrimination.

2.12 Concern for Personal Safety and Perceived Discrimination

Concern for personal safety is closely related to a sense of well-being (Perreault, 2017). Perreault (2017) says that many studies have confirmed that a perceived lack of satisfaction with

safety might have different kinds of negative effects on individuals/immigrants and communities. For example, immigrants may withdraw from collective/community life out of fear of crime or lack of safety and this situation may erode social cohesion (Cobbina et al., 2008). This means that immigrants who report less satisfaction with personal safety might be more likely to perceive discrimination than their immigrant counterparts who are satisfied with their personal safety. Moreover, Hale (1996) shows that individuals/immigrants may increase spending to protect themselves from crime or may move away from a specific community because of a sense of insecurity. Adams and Serpe (2000), Lorenc and her associates (2012) and Foster and his colleagues (2014) show that dissatisfaction with personal safety or a sense of insecurity may pose negative impacts on individuals/immigrants' mental, physical soundness as well as overall well-being.

2.13 Conclusion

This literature review shows that some studies have focused on the experience of perceived discrimination, but some of these did not focus directly on perceived discrimination in a broad sense, among immigrants especially racialized groups of immigrants. Although some findings that indicate that the lack of human capital or social capital is largely responsible for negative labour market outcomes for immigrants to Canada, the research also indicates that along with negative labour market outcomes, immigrants face several other kinds of problems in Canada because of discrimination.

Chapter Three

Source of Data and Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology of the study. It consists of eight sections. The first section describes the source of data. The second section describes the sampling techniques and the nature of sample. The third section focuses on the methods used in this study. The fourth part consists of the operationalization of variables. The fifth section discusses the data analysis technique; the sixth section checks the assumptions of statistical analysis. The seventh section describes the advantages and limitations of using secondary data as well limitations of the study. The last section discusses the ethical considerations of the study.

3.2 Source of Data

The data are accessed from the Statistics Canada master data file of General Social Survey (GSS) 2014 through the Manitoba Research Data Centre at the University of Manitoba. Statistics Canada has been conducting the GSS since 1985. Cycle 28 of the GSS 2014 on Canadians' Safety (Victimization) was the sixth cycle that collected information on victimization as well as discrimination (1988, 1993, 1999, 2004, and 2009).

The GSS 2014 collected data from respondents from all 10 provinces and 3 territories (Statistics Canada, 2017). The GSS is a post-census survey, meaning the sample participating is actually drawn from the previous (2011) National Household Survey.

The GSS 2014 collected information on perceived discrimination because of age, sex, race/skin colour, ethnicity, physical appearance, religion, sexual orientation, physical/mental disability, and language from both Canadians and immigrants (Statistics Canada, 2017). The GSS 2014 collected data on Canadians' and immigrants' experience of discrimination in the

work environment or when applying for a job or promotion as well as their experience of discrimination in banks, stores, and restaurants (Statistics Canada, 2017). The GSS 2014 provides the most recent data about whether Canadians and immigrants perceive discrimination in different situations/incidences. This dataset also contains the information regarding immigrants' continent of birth (geographical macro-region) and the year they first entered Canada which are helpful in answering research questions.

As a secondary source of data, the GSS 2014 allows the researcher to distinguish between racialized and non-racialized immigrants, ethnicity, number of years living in Canada (number of years since immigrants first came to Canada), continent of birth (geographical macro-region), age, sex, and role of educational qualifications and the influence of household languages in perceiving discrimination in Canada. The GSS 2014 also has information on other issues such as whether respondents live in a welcoming community or not, disruptive neighbours' behavioural patterns, the perceived trends of crime in the neighbourhood, whether respondents are satisfied with personal safety from crime, whether respondents took any protective actions out of fear of crime, whether respondents have trust in strangers or not, the level of sense of belonging to the local community, whether respondents live in urban or rural areas, and whether respondents were employed at any time in the last 12 months.

The researcher used Statistical Package for Social Sciences software to analyze the data. The univariate and bivariate results are analyzed based on the publicly accessible micro data file of GSS 2014, while multivariate analysis is based on master data file which is accessed through Manitoba Research Data Centre (RDC). All results were vetted by the RDC analyst to maintain the confidentiality of the respondents. A proposal to access the master data was approved by Statistics Canada.

3.3 Description of Sampling and Sample

The General Social Survey has a cross-sectional design and its target population includes the Canadian population aged 15 and over, living in the ten Canadian provinces and the three territories. Canadians who are residing full-time in institutions are not included in the survey population (Perreault, 2015). This study includes only immigrants of ages 15 years and above who have ever immigrated to Canada.

The GSS 2014 is a probability survey, as the sample was randomly selected from households in the ten provinces. The micro data file from the main survey in the 10 provinces consists of questionnaire responses from 33,127 respondents (Statistics Canada, 2017).

The GSS 2014 used Random-digit dialing (RDD) to contact respondents. The RDD method selected households such a way that each telephone number is considered as a stratum that had an equal chance of being selected. The RDD method was set in such a way so that it could avoid the problem of not being able to reach new or unlisted telephone numbers especially when using existing phone lists. Data were collected by computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) from January to December, 2014 (Perreault, 2015). Individuals without landlines were excluded from the sampling frame.

The data for GSS are normally collected over a 6 to 12 month period. The average duration of an interview is 40 to 45 minutes. Responding to the GSS is voluntary and respondents could respond in the official language of their choice. An oversample of immigrants and youth was added to the GSS 2014 for a more detailed/comprehensive analysis of these groups.

Although the total sample size of GSS 2014 is 33,127, the present study is restricted to immigrants only (N=7,090) (see Tables 3.1). The focus categories for this study are immigrants

between the ages of 25 to 64 years old as these groups of immigrants are most likely to be active in the labour market. As mentioned earlier, the univariate and bivariate analyses are accomplished based on the data available in micro data files of GSS 2014 (N=7,090), but the multivariate analysis is accomplished on the basis of master data¹ file that is accessed through the Manitoba Research Data Centre (RDC). The sample size of master file varies slightly from that of the micro data file of GSS 2014. I cannot report the exact sample size of master data file regarding immigrants of GSS 2014 as Statistics Canada does not release unweighted sample size. However, the sample sizes of the six separate multivariate logistic regression models for six racialized groups of immigrants is at least N=400 or above which is large enough to fulfill the assumptions for logistic regression. The dependent variable of this study is binomial, measuring the presence or absence of discrimination. This study employs a logistic regression model to examine the associations and influences of racialized status and other socio-demographic as well as some other independent variables on perceived discrimination among immigrants to Canada. I limit my study to examine perceived discrimination among immigrants to Canada. Initially, I had hoped to examine the relationships and effects of racialized status as well as other socio-demographic factors on the perceived discrimination among immigrants in the work environment, but the GSS 2014 data has only one question regarding the experience of discrimination in work environment and hence it is not a strong or stable indicator.

¹ As the master data file consists of separate data for each racialized group and the study's purpose is to see whether different racialized groups of immigrants perceive discrimination differently or not.

Table 3.1 Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Study Population			
Variables & Categories	Percentage (%)		Modal Category
Age (N=7,090, missing=0%)	N	%	
15 to 24 years	1,377	19.4	15 to 24 is modal category
25 to 34 years	837	11.8	
35 to 44 years	1,218	17.2	
45 to 54 years	1,169	16.5	
55 to 64 years	1,009	14.2	
65 to 74 years	908	12.8	
75 years and older	572	8.1	
Sex (N=7,090, missing=0%)			
Female	3,724	52.5	Female
Male	3,366	47.5	
Educational Qualifications (N=7,090, missing=2.6%)			
Less than high school diploma or its equivalent	882	12.8	High school diploma
High school diploma/high school equivalency certificate	1,672	24.2	
Trade certificate or diploma	308	4.5	
College, CEGEP/other non-university certificate or diploma	1,293	18.7	
University certificate or diploma below the bachelor's level	271	3.9	
Bachelor's degree (e.g. B.A., B.Sc., LL.B.)	1,559	22.6	
University certificate, diploma/degree above bachelor's	919	13.3	
Visible Minority (N=7,090, missing=0.9%)			
Non-visible minority	3,168	45.1	Visible Minority
Visible minority	3,855	54.9	
Number of Years living in Canada (N=7,090, missing=2.1%)			
More than 10 years	5,284	76.1	More than 10 Years
Up to 10 years	1,660	23.9	

Continent of Birth (Macro region) (N=7,090, missing=4.9%)			
Americas, Europe & Oceania/Antarctica & adjacent islands ²	3,548	52.6	Americas, Europe & Oceania/Antarctica & adjacent islands
Asia & Africa	3,197	47.4	
Household Language (N=7,090, missing=3.9%)			
English or French or both & other languages	5,179	76.0	English or French or both & other languages
Other language only	1,638	24.0	

Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

Table 3.1 shows the socio-demographic characteristics of immigrants under study. Forty-seven percent of the respondents are male and 52.5 percent are female. The modal age group is 15 to 24 years.

Twenty-four percent of the immigrants have achieved a high school diploma/high school equivalency certificate. Twenty-two percent have achieved a Bachelor’s degree, followed by 18.7 percent who achieved a college certificate or equivalent diploma, and 13.3 percent who achieved university certificate, diploma or the degree which is above the Bachelor level. About thirteen percent have less than a high school diploma or equivalent.

The majority (54.9 percent) of immigrants are members of a racialized minority. Out of the immigrants of this study, 52.6 percent originated from the Americas, Europe, and Oceania/Antarctica and adjacent islands while the share of immigrants who are originated from Asia and Africa is 47.4 percent. With regard to immigrants’ household languages, Table 3.1 shows that about 76.0 percent of immigrant respondents use English or French or both and other languages as their household languages, while 24.0 percent of immigrants use other language

² As most of the immigrants from America are white, the researcher considered them as non-racialized, but there might be some racialized immigrants from Pacific islands and Caribbean population.

only. Most of the immigrants (76.1 percent) have lived in Canada more than 10 years compared to 23.9 percent immigrants who have been living here 10 years or less.

3.4 Methods Used in the Study

The GSS uses a cross sectional survey design in which all immigrants were surveyed by telephone and then redirected to the electronic questionnaire (Statistics Canada, 2017). This study collects data from immigrants to examine the association between being a racialized immigrant and perceived discrimination in Canada. Several other socio-demographic variables, such as, *age, sex, educational qualifications, continent of birth, number of years living in Canada, and household languages*, and other independent variables, for example, *living in a welcoming community, disruptive neighbours' behavioural patterns, the increasing or decreasing trends of crime in the neighbourhood, concern for personal safety from crime, protective actions taken out of fear of crime in last 12 months, trust in strangers, sense of belonging to the local community, living in urban or rural areas, and employment main activity during the past 12 months* are also examined in identifying whether these independent variables have any impact on experiencing/perceiving discrimination among immigrants to Canada

The study uses a *Global Discrimination Index (discussed below)* as the dependent variable and *age group1 (25 to 34 years) (ref. else), age group2 (35 to 44 years) (ref. else), age group3 (45 to 54 years) (ref. else), age group4 (55 to 64 years) (ref. else), sex (ref. female), educational qualifications, visible minority status (ref. non-visible minority), continent of birth (geographical macro region) (ref. Americas, Europe & Oceania/Antarctica & its adjacent islands), number of years living in Canada (ref. more than 10 years), and household languages (ref. English or French or both & other languages)* as independent variables. The following

variables are also considered as independent variables: *living in a welcoming community* (ref. yes), *disruptive neighbours' behavioural patterns* (ref. a small or moderate problem), *increasing or decreasing crime in neighbourhood* (ref. decreasing crime), *concern for personal safety from crime* (ref. satisfied with personal safety), *protective actions taken out of fear of crime* (ref. no i.e. not taking protective actions), *trust in strangers* (ref. can be trusted more or a lot), *sense of belonging to the local community* (ref. yes), *living in urban or rural areas* (ref. living in urban areas), and *Employment main activity during the past 12 months* (ref. unemployed & all who not in labour market).

The study is guided by the following research questions: Is there discrimination against immigrants to Canada? If there is discrimination, what socio-demographic factors play a significant role in creating this situation for immigrants to Canada? Depending on these questions, the study has three sub-questions: a) Are some groups of immigrants more likely to perceive discrimination than others? b) How do age, sex, language skills, levels of education, continent of birth (geographical macro region), and number of years living in Canada, effect immigrants' perception of discrimination? c) How do neighbourhood crime, disruptive neighbours' behavioural patterns, personal safety from crime, protective actions taken out of fear of crime, welcoming community, and sense of belonging to community influence on perceived discrimination?

At this stage, suitable statistical tools or models are chosen on the basis of the level of measurement of the variables used in the study. The following section discusses the information related to the conceptualization of variables.

3.5 Conceptualization of Variables

The *Global discrimination index* is the dependent variable while visible minority status of immigrants is considered as the main independent variable in this study. The variables *age, sex, educational qualifications, continent of birth (geographical macro region), number of years living in Canada, and the household languages* are socio-demographic independent variables. Other independent variables are: *living in a welcoming community, disruptive neighbours' behavioural patterns, increasing or decreasing crime in neighbourhood, concern for personal safety from crime, protective actions taken out of fear of crime in the last 12 months, trust in strangers, sense of belonging to local community, living in urban or rural areas, and employment main activity during the past 12 months.*

3.5.1 Dependent Variable

This study uses the *global discrimination index (GDI)* as the dependent variable. The GDI is bivariate in nature. Discrimination, in this study, “means treating people differently, negatively or adversely because of their race, age, religion, sex, etc.” (GSS 2014 Victimization Main File, 2017, 182). The global discrimination index is calculated using 6 questionnaire items that related to various aspects of discrimination (see Table 3.2). These 6 items were used to create a “global discrimination index” using exploratory factor analysis. All the items are recoded as 0= “no”, and 1= “yes” and the binary code is maintained for the analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measures of sampling adequacy score is 0.820 and the reliability of these items was confirmed with Cronbach’s Alpha for 0.858. A sum of scores was calculated from the 6 items, with higher scores indicating experience of discrimination in more than one situations/ incidences. Because this variable is skewed and kurtosed, I coded it as a binomial variable and will use logistic regression as the data analysis technique.

<p>Table 3.2 Items used in the Global Discrimination Index³ (GDI) Alpha=0.858, Mean=0.59, Std.=1.355, Skewness=2.200, Kurtosis=3.643, N=7,090, and Missing=0%</p>
DIS_15: In the past five years, have you experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly by others in Canada because of your ethnicity or culture?
DIS_20: In the past five years, have you experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly by others in Canada because of your race or colour?
DTS_20: In what types of situations have you experienced discrimination in the past 5 years? Was it in a store, bank or restaurant?
DTS_25: In what types of situations have you experienced discrimination in the past 5 years? Was it at work or when applying for a job or promotion?
DIS_50: In the past five years, have you experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly by others in Canada because of your language?
DISCRIM: Respondent has been a victim of discrimination in the past five years.

Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

3.5.2 Independent Variables

Visible Minority: Visible minority⁴ status of immigrants is the main independent variable in the present study. Visible minority/racialized minority refers to the category of immigrants who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour (Statistics Canada, 2017). According to the Canadian Employment Equity Act (1995), a visible minority is a person/immigrant who is other than Indigenous person, but non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour. The visible minority immigrants belong to either South Asian, Chinese, Black, Filipino/a, Latin American, Middle Eastern, Southeast Asian, West Asian, Korean, or Japanese groups (Statistics Canada, 2015). This study examines whether visible minority/racialized groups of immigrants are more likely to experience/perceive discrimination than their white immigrant counterparts. As the

³ Although these six question items are loosely fit together, these items came out as statistically significant to make an index for measuring perceived discrimination.

⁴ Actually, Statistics Canada uses the term “visible minority”, but it has fallen out of favour (in fact, the United Nations criticizes Canada in its annual report for Canada’s continued use of this term).

visible minority status variable is categorical, it is recoded as 0=non-visible minority i.e. 45.1 percent and 1=visible minority i.e. 54.9 percent (see Table 3.4 for operational scheme of dependent and independent variables and see Table 3.1 for frequency distribution).

Several other independent variables are used to examine the experience of discrimination against immigrants (see Table 3.1). These are age, sex, educational qualification, continent of birth (geographical macro region), number of years living in Canada, household language, disruptive neighbours' behavioural patterns, living in a welcoming community, neighbourhood crime increasing or decreasing, sense of belonging to community, population centres indicator, employment main activities during the last 12 months, concern for personal safety from crime, protective actions taken out of fear of crime in the last 12 months, and trust in strangers.

Age: Age, a continuous level variable, is used to see if there are differences between younger and older immigrants with regard to experiencing discrimination. The age variable is coded as 1=15 to 24 years, 2=25 to 34 years, 3=35 to 44 years, 4=45 to 54 years, 5=55 to 64 years, 6=65 to 74, and 7=75 years and older and treated as an ordinal level measure. The N=7,090 and the percentage of missing value is 0. With regard to measure precisely the varying degree of perceived discrimination based on the variation in ages, the researcher recoded 'AGEGR10' variable into four dummy age variables. These variables include : 'VARAGE1 (1=25 to 34 years i.e. 11.8 percent and 0=else i.e. 88.2 percent)', 'VARAGE2 (1= 35 to 44 years which consist of 17.2 percent while 0=else that consists of 82.8 percent)', 'VARAGE3 (1=45 to 54 years that comprise of 16.5 percent whereas 0=else consists of 83.5 percent)', 'VARAGE4 (1=55 to 64 years i.e. 14.2 percent and 0=else i.e. 85.8 percent)' as these age groups are most likely to be active in the labour markets These four dummy variables are used in the multivariate logistic regression analysis.

Sex: Sex is recoded as 0 = female and 1 = male. Valid N=7,090 and there are no missing values.

Educational Qualification: Educational Qualification is an interval level variable. This variable is measured on a 7– category scale, which ranges from 1 =Less than high school diploma or its equivalent, 2=High school diploma/high school equivalency certificate, 3=Trade certificate or diploma, 4=College, CEGEP/other non-university certificate or diploma, 5=University certificate or diploma below the bachelor's level, 6=Bachelor's degree (e.g. B.A., B.Sc., LL.B.), to 7=University certificate, diploma/degree above bachelor's. N=7,090 and the percentage of missing values is 2.6 percent. It too is treated ordinally.

Number of years living in Canada: Number of years since immigrants first came to Canada, is used to measure time in Canada. The range of the variable is 12 and ranged from 1=Before 1946, 2=1946 to 1959, 3=1960 to 1964, 4=1965 to 1969, 5=1970 to 1974, 6=1975 to 1979, 7=1980 to 1984, 8=1985 to 1989, 9=1990 to 1994, 10=1995 to 1999, 11=2000 to 2004, 12=2005 to 2009, and 13=2010 to 2014. N=7,090 and the percentage of missing values is 2.1 percent. This variable is transformed into a binary dummy variable and recoded as up to 10 years=1 i.e. the immigrants who entered Canada in-between 2005 to 2014, and more than 10 years=0 i.e. the immigrants who entered Canada before 2005 and this recoded version of the variable is used in the bivariate analysis as well as in the multivariate logistic regression model. Table 3.1 shows that majority of immigrants surveyed have lived in Canada more than 10 years. The ten year coding is conventional in current research as ten years tends to demarcate the time at which most immigrants have learned an official language, obtained a job commensurate with their education level and have acquired Canadian citizenship.

Continent of Birth (geographical macro region): Continent of birth is recoded as 0=Americas, Europe & Oceania/Antarctica & adjacent islands and 1=Asia & Africa. Valid N=7,090 and percentage of missing values is 4.9. Actual country of birth is not used in the final analysis due to collinearity problems.

Household Language: Household language skill in English or French or both or other language is recoded as 1 = Other language only and 0 =English or French or both & other languages. N=7,090 and the percentage of missing values is 3.9.

Disruptive Neighbours' Behaviour Index (DNBI): An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was run on the basis of 7 items which identify immigrants' disruptive neighbours' behavioural patterns (see Table 3.3 for questionnaire items), where the questionnaire items are measured on a four point scale (from 1= "A big problem" to 4= "not a problem at all"). However, the original code has been reversed i.e. 1= "not a problem at all" to 4= "A big problem." The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measures of sampling adequacy score is 0.89 and the reliability of these items was also confirmed with Cronbach's Alpha for 0.83. The skewness and Kurtosis of this variable are 2.453 and 6.946 respectively while mean =8.85, standard deviation (SD) =3.272, range=27, minimum=1, maximum=28, N=7,090 and the percentage of missing values is 0%. To deal with the skewness and kurtosis problems, this index is transformed into a binary variable. At this point the mean becomes 0.50, SD=0.500, Skewness=0.015, Kurtosis= -2.000, range=1, minimum=0, maximum=1, and missing cases are 0%. As a result, those immigrants who report facing 1 to 7 points of severity of annoying/disturbing situations in the neighbours have been categorized as *A small or moderate problem (50.4 percent)* while those who experience more than 7 points of severity of annoying/disturbing situations from neighbours have been categorized as *A big problem (49.6 percent)*.

Table 3.3 Items used in the Disruptive Neighbours' Behaviour Index (DNBI) Alpha=0.83, Mean=8.85, Std.=3.272, Skewness=2.453, Kurtosis=6.946, N=7,090, and Missing=0%
SDQ_110: In your neighbourhood, how much of a problem are noisy neighbours or loud parties?
SDQ_120: In your neighbourhood, how much of a problem are people hanging around on the streets?
SDQ_140: In your neighbourhood, how much of a problem is garbage or litter lying around?
SDQ_150: In your neighbourhood, how much of a problem is vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles?
SDQ_160: In your neighbourhood, how much of a problem are people being attacked or harassed because of their skin colour, ethnic origin or religion?
SDQ_170: In your neighbourhood, how much of a problem are people using or dealing drug?
SDQ_180: In your neighbourhood, how much of a problem are people being drunk or rowdy in public places?

Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

Living in a Welcoming Community: Living in a welcoming community is used to examine whether immigrants who do not live in a welcoming community are more likely to perceive discrimination than their counterparts. This dummy variable is recoded as 1= No i.e. who do not live in a welcoming community (6.9 percent) and 0= Yes, who live in a welcoming community (93.1 percent). Here, N= 7,090 and missing cases are 2.6 percent. This recoded dummy variable is used in the multivariate logistic regression analysis.

Neighbourhood Crime Increasing or Decreasing: Increasing or decreasing crime in the neighbourhood is used to see whether immigrants who live in neighbourhoods where the crime rate is increasing are more likely to perceive discrimination than their counterparts. This binary dummy variable is recoded as 0= decreasing crime (76.7 percent), and 1= Increasing crime or the same level of crime (23.3 percent). The sample size is N=7,090 and missing values = 9.6 percent. This binary categorized variable is used in the logistic regression analysis.

Sense of Belonging to Community: This variable is used to see whether immigrants who have a very weak or a somewhat weak sense of belonging to the local community are more likely to perceive discrimination than their counterparts. This binary dummy variable is recoded as 0= Very strong or somewhat strong sense of belonging (75.8 percent), and 1= Very weak or somewhat weak sense of belonging (24.2 percent). N=7,090 and missing values =4.9 percent and this binary categorized variable is also used in the logistic regression analysis.

Population Centres Indicator Variable: Population centres indicator is used to determine whether immigrants who live in rural areas/small population centres are more likely to perceive discrimination than their counterparts. The binary dummy variable is recoded as 0= larger urban population centres (CMA/CA) (94.5 percent), and 1= Rural areas/small population centres (non-CMA/CA) (5.5 percent). The sample size is N=7,090 and missing cases=0.6 percent. This dummy variable is used in the logistic regression analysis.

Employment Main Activity During the Past 12 Months: Employment main activity during the past 12 months variable is used to see whether employment has any impact on perceived discrimination among immigrants. The variable is recoded as a binary dummy variable where 0 stands for unemployed and all who are not in the labour market (48.0 percent) and 1 for employed (52.0 percent). Here, N=7,090 and the missing values are 0.2 percent. The recoded dummy variable is used in the multivariate logistic regression analysis.

Concern for Personal Safety from Crime: To measure whether the level of satisfaction with personal safety from crime has any influence on experiencing/perceiving discrimination among immigrants or not, this variable is turned into a binary dummy variable following 1= very dissatisfied or dissatisfied or neutral (10.9 percent), and 0= satisfied or very satisfied (89.1

percent). The sample size is 7,090 and missing values =1.3 percent. This dummy variable is also entered in multivariate logistic regression analysis.

Protective Actions Taken out of fear of Crime in the last 12 months: This variable is used to examine whether protective actions taken out of fear of crime in the last 12 month has any influence on experiencing/perceiving discrimination among immigrants. The variable is recoded as a dummy binary variable where 1 stands for *yes (13.8 percent)*, and 0 for *no (86.2 percent)*. Here, the N=7,090 and missing cases are 0.3 percent. This dummy variable is also entered in multivariate logistic regression analysis.

Trust in Strangers: To measure whether the level/degree of trust in strangers has an effect on experiencing/perceiving discrimination among immigrants, this variable is turned into a dummy binary variable following 1= cannot be trusted at all (42.4 percent), and 0= can be trusted more or a lot (57.6 percent). The sample size is N=7,090 and there are no missing values. This dummy variable is used in the multivariate logistic regression analysis.

Table 3.4 Operationalization of Dependent and Independent Variables

Variables	Operationalization/Coding patterns
Global Discrimination Index/Perceived Discrimination	1= Ever been discriminated against in one or more incidences, 0= Never been discriminated against
Age1	1= 25 to 34 years, 0=Else
Age2	1= 35 to 44 years, 0=Else
Age3	1= 45 to 54 years, 0=Else
Age4	1= 55 to 64 years, 0=Else
Educational Qualifications	Interval
Number of years living in Canada	1= Up to 10 years, 0= More than 10 years
Sex	1= Male, 0= Female
Visible Minority Status	1= Visible minority, 0= Non-visible minority
Continent of birth (Geographical macro region)	1= Asia & Africa, 0= Americas, Europe & Oceania/Antarctica & adjacent islands

Household Languages	1= Other language only 0= English or French or both & other languages
Disruptive Neighbours' Behavioural Pattern	1= A big problem, 0= A small or moderate problem
Living in a Welcoming Community	1= No, 0= Yes
Neighbourhood Crime Increasing or Decreasing	1= Increasing crime or the same, 0= Decreasing crime
Sense of Belonging	1= Very weak or somewhat weak sense of belonging, 0= Very strong or somewhat strong sense of belonging
Population Centers Indicator	1= Rural areas/small population centres (non-CMA/CA), 0= Larger urban population centres (CMA/CA)
Employment Main Activity During the Past 12 Months	1= Employed, 0= Unemployed & all who not in labour market
Concern for Personal Safety from Crime	1= Very dissatisfied or dissatisfied or neutral, 0= Satisfied or very satisfied
Protective Actions Taken out of Fear of Crime in the last 12 Months	1= Yes, 0= No
Trust in Strangers	1= Cannot be trusted at all, 0= Can be trusted more or a lot

3.6 Analytical Procedures

This study is conducted on the basis of three levels of data analysis – univariate, bivariate, and multivariate.. The univariate analysis depicts the frequency distribution of the dependent and independent variables. The second step of analysis is the bivariate analysis that measures the relationship between each independent variable and the dependent variable. Bivariate analysis is helpful in identifying statistically significant associations between dependent and independent variables. To examine statistical significance, cross-tabulations and tests of significance are also run.

The multivariate analysis consists of logistic regression analysis. Logistic regression analysis is appropriate because the dependent variable is categorical in nature and because it permits us to measure the effect of each independent variable on perceived discrimination among immigrants, while controlling for all other independent variables. To perform multivariate analysis, eight logistic regression models (racialized minority model, non- racialized minority model, and models with six racialized groups) were performed separately. The racialized groups included in the analysis are South Asian, Chinese, African and Caribbean Filipino/a, Latin American, and Middle Eastern immigrants. Due to small numbers of immigrants in the racialized groups of Southeast Asian, West Asian, Korean, and Japanese immigrants were not included in this part of the analysis.

3.7 Assumption Checking

Maintaining linearity, normality, and homoscedasticity are not necessary for logistic regression analysis because the dependent variable does not act like a continuous level variable with linear relations, bell curves and heteroscedasticity. However, much like Ordinary Least Squares Regression, observations need to be independent of each other and there should not be any multicollinearity among independent variables (see Table A.1)

The sample size should also be large enough to accommodate all the independent variables entered into the equation. The sample size is large ($N = 7,090$) so the study fulfills the assumptions for logistic regression analysis relative to the number of independent variables (17) in the logistic regression.

There are only three interactions (see Table A.1) among the seventeen independent variables which are age and visible minority status ($r = -.416^{**}$); age and number of years living in Canada ($r = -.426^{**}$) and educational qualification and employment main activity during the past 12 months ($r = .323^{**}$). Among these interactions, the interaction between age and time (living) in Canada has been ignored even though it breaks the independence assumption and I kept these variables in the logistic regression models because the study examines whether young and middle aged immigrants are more likely to perceive discrimination than their older immigrant counterparts.

To deal with the interaction between age and visible minority status of immigrants, two separate logistic regression models are developed. The first model includes only visible minority immigrants while the second one is for non-visible minority immigrants. Moreover, as the interaction between educational qualification and employment main activity during the past 12

months ($r = .323^{**}$) are slightly over $r = 0.30$, these two variables are also ignored and kept in logistic regression analyses.

3.8 Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Secondary Data & Limitations of the Study

There are advantages and disadvantages in using the GSS 2014 to study the perception of discrimination among immigrants. First, the data are of high quality as this survey was conducted by an internationally respected and government operated statistics department and the data are available at no cost. Second, the sample size is large enough to fulfill one of the essential assumptions of the logistic regression model. Finally, GSS 2014 data is the latest national data set dealing with the perceived discrimination among immigrants. The disadvantage was the length of time it took to get access to the GSS 2014 master data file to attain the micro level data needed to do the individual ethnic group analyses. Another was that the survey did not include data on the source country of immigrants' educational qualification which is very important in determining likelihood of perceiving discrimination among immigrants. As a result, I had to drop a proposed hypothesis related to the perception of discrimination based on the source country of immigrants' education.

Finally, my major limitation was that I could not ask more questions about discrimination, especially work place discrimination and that is the reason I had to change my research question and analysis.

3.9 Ethical Considerations of the Study

Since the present study uses secondary data, there are few ethical considerations. The GSS 2014 publicly accessible micro data file that this study uses was obtained from the library of the University of Manitoba while the GSS 2014 master data file was obtained from Statistics

Canada through Manitoba Research Data Centre (RDC). The use of GSS 2014 master data file was conducted in full compliance with Statistics Canada ethics, rules and guidelines. Moreover, with a view to maintaining confidentiality of respondents/immigrants identity, a contract was signed between the researcher and the Manitoba Research Data Centre. As a result, both the parties are committed not to disclose the identity of any respondents.

Furthermore, the outputs of multivariate analyses were vetted by the RDC analyst before releasing the data to the researcher in order to ensuring confidentiality. With a view to protecting the confidentiality of respondents/immigrants, frequency cells that contain less than ten frequencies were removed from the analysis.

3.10 Conclusion

This chapter has presented the methodology of the study highlighting the data source, the descriptions of the survey population, sampling techniques and sample, research method used in the study, operationalization of both dependent and independent variables, data analysis procedures, assumptions checking, and limitations and ethical considerations of the study.

Chapter Four

Results and Discussion

4.1 Results

4.1.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the study. The first three sections of the chapter present the findings of univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analyses. The last section presents the discussion of the main findings as they relate to the literature concerning discrimination against immigrants.

4.1.2 Results of the Univariate Analysis

This section presents the findings of the univariate analysis, which is the first step in analyzing the study population. The data in Table 4.1 shows that, about 19 percent of immigrants experience/perceive discrimination in various situations after entering Canada.

Table 4.1 Percentage of Immigrants' Experience/Perception of Discrimination

Experience/perceive Discrimination	Frequency (N=7090)	Percentage (%)
No	5755	81.3
Yes	1324	18.7
Total	7079	100.0

Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

4.1.3 Results of the Bivariate Analysis

Tables 4.2 to 4.13 present the results of the bivariate analysis, where I examine the degree and direction of association between perceived discrimination and the predictor variables.

4.1.3.1 Racialized Minority Status and Perceived Discrimination

Table 4.2 shows the difference between racialized minority and non-racialized minority immigrants with regard to their perception of discrimination because of different reasons or incidences/situations. Separate questions were asked regarding discrimination based on ethnicity versus skin colour. Fourteen percent of racialized immigrants perceived discrimination because of their ethnicity and a similar proportion of racialized immigrants (14 percent) perceived discrimination due to their race or skin colour. This can be compared with corresponding figures of 4.6 percent and 2.1 percent for non-racialized immigrants. The results reveal that more than twice as many racialized immigrants as non-racialized immigrants perceived discrimination due to language or accent (7.4 percent compared with 3.4 percent respectively). When asked if they had ever perceived discrimination at work or when applying for a job or promotion, 11 percent of racialized immigrants answered ‘Yes’, compared with 6.2 percent of non-racialized immigrants. When asked if they had ever perceived discrimination in a store, bank, or restaurant, 10.7 percent of racialized immigrants’ perceived discrimination compared with 4 percent of non-racialized immigrants. Furthermore, when asked if they had perceived discrimination in Canada in the last 5 years, 23.1 percent of racialized immigrants answered ‘Yes’, compared with 13.3 percent of non-racialized immigrants.

Table 4.3 gives us specific information regarding what percentage of immigrants faced how many events of discrimination in the six situations included in the survey.

Table 4.2 Immigrants' Racialized Minority Status and Experience of Discrimination in Some Situations as well as due to Race, Ethnicity, and Language

Basis/situations of discrimination	Racialized minority immigrants (N=3,855)		Non-racialized minority immigrants (N=3,168)	
	N	%	N	%
Race or skin colour ($\chi^2 = 309.773$, df= 1, $P \leq 0.001$)	535	14	67	2.1
Ethnicity or culture ($\chi^2 = 182.661$, df= 1, $P \leq 0.001$)	546	14.2	144	4.6
Language ($\chi^2 = 52.849$, df= 1, $P \leq 0.001$)	285	7.4	108	3.4
Discrimination at work or when applying for a job or promotion ($\chi^2 = 49.060$, df= 1, $P \leq 0.001$)	422	11	196	6.2
Discrimination in a store, bank, or restaurant ($\chi^2 = 110.545$, df= 1, $P \leq 0.001$)	413	10.7	127	4
Experience of discrimination in last 5 years ($\chi^2 = 109.855$, df= 1, $P \leq 0.001$)	889	23.1	421	13.3

Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

Table 4.3 Percentage of Immigrants' Experience of Discrimination by Number of Incidences/Situations

Number of discriminatory situations	Racialized minority (N=3,855)		Non-racialized minority (N=3,168)	
	N	%	N	%
0	2966	76.9	2747	86.7
1	53	1.4	78	2.5
2	144	3.7	154	4.9
3	245	6.4	105	3.3
4	262	6.8	61	1.9
5	144	3.7	20	0.6
6	41	1.1	3	0.1

Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

The data in Table 4.3 show that almost none (0.1 percent) of non-racialized immigrants experienced discrimination in all six situations compared with 1.1 percent of racialized immigrants.

In order to distinguish between the immigrants who have never been discriminated against and those who have ever been discriminated against, I have created a binary categorized distribution (see Table 4.4) based on the information from Table 4.3. Here, the immigrants who did not face discrimination in any of the aforementioned six aspects/incidences are categorized as *never been discriminated against* whereas all other immigrants who faced/perceived discrimination in any one or more of these aspects/incidences are grouped as *ever been discriminated against in one or more incidences*.

Table 4.4 Cross-tabulation and Chi-Square test of Significance for Perceived Discrimination and Racialized Minority Status of Immigrants

Discrimination perceived by Immigrants	Racialized Minority Status of Immigrants				Total (%)
	Racialized minority		Non-racialized minority		
	N	%	N	%	
Never been discriminated against	2966	76.9	2747	86.7	5713 (81.3)
Ever been discriminated against in one or more incidences	889	23.1	421	13.3	1310 (18.7)
Total	3855	100.0	3168	100.0	7023 (100.0)

Note: $\chi^2 = 109.433$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.001$. Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

The data of Table 4.4 depict that among the racialized minority (3,855) immigrants, 23.1 percent (889) report ever having been discriminated against in either one or

more incidences or situations in Canada compared to 421 (13.3 percent) out of 3,168 non-racialized minority immigrants. Therefore, the results of Table 4.4 reveal that racialized immigrants are more likely to perceive discrimination compared to their non-racialized minority counterparts and this difference is statistically significant.

4.1.3.2 Socio-demographic Variables and their Influence on Perceived Discrimination

The results of bivariate analyses i.e. cross-tabulations regarding socio-demographic factors reveal that except for sex and years living in Canada, all other socio-demographic variables are statistically and significantly associated with perceived discrimination.

Age

The results of Table 4.5 show that age is statistically related to perceived discrimination. Younger immigrants are more likely to report having experienced discrimination than older immigrants and that as age increases, the propensity to experience discrimination decreases.

Table 4.5 Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square test of Significance for Discrimination Perceived by Immigrants and Different Age Groups of Immigrants

Discrimination perceived by Immigrants	Age groups from 25 years to 64 years old of the respondents				Total (%)
	25 to 34 years (%)	35 to 44 years (%)	45 to 54 years (%)	55 to 64 years (%)	
Never been discriminated against	633 (75.6)	970 (79.6)	926 (79.2)	841 (83.3)	3,370 (79.6)
Ever been discriminated against in one or more incidences	204 (24.4)	248 (20.4)	243 (20.8)	168 (16.7)	863 (20.4)
Total	837 (100.0)	1,218 (100.0)	1,169 (100.0)	1,009 (100.0)	4,233 (100.0)

Note: $\chi^2 = 16.989$, $df = 3$, $P \leq 0.001$. Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

4.1.3.3 The Influence of Other Independent Variables on Perceived Discrimination

Employment Main Activity

Table 4.6 shows that immigrants who are employed experience more discrimination (20.4 percent) than their immigrant counterparts who are unemployed or not in the labour market (16.9 percent).

Disruptive Neighbours

The level of perceived discrimination is related to the immigrants' views concerning the disruptive neighbours' behavioural problems. Table 4.7 shows that immigrants who identify their disruptive neighbours' behaviour as a big problem are more likely to perceive discrimination than their counterparts who see it as a small or moderate problem (24.6 percent compared with 12.8 percent).

Crime Trends

According to Table 4.8 immigrants who live in a neighbourhood in where crime is increasing or remaining the same are more likely to perceive discrimination than their immigrant counterparts who live in a less crime-prone neighbourhoods (25.9 percent compared with 16.4 percent).

Welcoming Community

Table 4.9 shows that immigrants who do not live in a welcoming community are more likely to perceive discrimination than immigrants whose community is welcoming in nature (31.3 percent compared with 17.3 percent).

Sense of Belonging

Table 4.10 shows that immigrants whose sense of belonging to local community is somewhat weak or very weak are more likely to perceive discrimination than their immigrant counterparts who hold somewhat strong or very strong sense of belonging (27.4 percent compared with 16.1 percent).

Concern for Personal Safety

Table 4.11 shows that almost two-thirds (33 percent) immigrants who were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with regard to their concern for personal safety from crime are more likely to perceive discrimination compared to their counterpart immigrants (about 17 percent) who were satisfied or very satisfied with their personal safety.

Protective Actions Taken Because of Fear of Crime

The results of Table 4.12 show that among immigrants who took any sort of protective actions because of fear of crime, nearly two-thirds (28.6 percent) are more likely to perceive discrimination than their other immigrant counterparts who did not take any kind of protective actions (17 percent).

Table 4.6 Cross-tabulation and Chi-Square Test of Significance for Perceived Discrimination and Employment Status

Discrimination perceived by Immigrants	Employment Main Activity				Total (%)
	Unemployed & all who do not in labour market		Employed		
	N	%	N	%	
	Never been discriminated against	2,821	83.1	2,933	79.6
Ever been discriminated against in one or more instances	574	16.9	750	20.4	1,324 (18.7)
Total	3,395	100.0	3,683	100.0	7,078 (100)

Note: $\chi^2 = 13.880$, $df=1$, $P \leq 0.001$. Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

Table 4.7 Cross-tabulation and Chi-Square Test of Significance for Perceived Discrimination with Disruptive Neighbours' Behavioural Pattern

Discrimination perceived by Immigrants	Disruptive Neighbours' behavioural pattern				Total (%)
	A small or moderate problem		A big problem		
	N	%	N	%	
	Never been discriminated against	3,115	87.2	2,651	75.4
Ever been discriminated against in one or more instances	457	12.8	867	24.6	1,324 (18.7)
Total	3,572	100.0	3,518	100.0	7,090 (100)

Note: $\chi^2 = 163.901$, $df=1$, $P \leq 0.001$. Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

Table 4.8 Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square test of Significance for Perceived Discrimination with Neighbourhood Crime Increasing or Decreasing trend

Discrimination perceived by Immigrants	Neighbourhood crime- Increasing or decreasing trend				Total (%)
	Decreasing		Increasing or the same		
	N	%	N	%	
Never been discriminated against	4,110	83.6	1,106	74.1	5,216 (81.4)
Ever been discriminated against in one or more incidences	805	16.4	387	25.9	1,192 (18.6)
Total	4,915	100.0	1,493	100.0	6,408 (100)

Note: $\chi^2 = 68.868$, $df=1$, $P \leq 0.001$. Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

Table 4.9 Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square test of Significance for Perceived Discrimination with Living in a Welcoming Community

Discrimination perceived by Immigrants	Living in a welcoming community				Total (%)
	Yes		No		
	N	%	N	%	
Never been discriminated against	5,312	82.7	330	68.8	5,642 (81.7)
Ever been discriminated against in one or more incidences	1,115	17.3	150	31.3	1,265 (18.3)
Total	6,427	100.0	480	100.0	6,907 (100)

Note: $\chi^2 = 57.694$, $df=1$, $P \leq 0.001$. Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

Table 4.10 Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square test of Significance for Perceived Discrimination with Sense of Belonging to Local Community

Discrimination perceived by Immigrants	Sense of belonging to local community				Total (%)
	Very or somewhat strong		Very or somewhat weak		
	N	%	N	%	
Never been discriminated against	4,291	83.9	1,185	72.6	5,476 (81.2)
Ever been discriminated against in one or more incidences	821	16.1	448	27.4	1,269 (18.8)
Total	5,112	100.0	1,633	100.0	6,745 (100)

Note: $\chi^2 = 104.822$, $df=1$, $P \leq 0.001$. Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file,

Statistics Canada, calculations by author

Table 4.11 Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square test of Significance for perceived Discrimination with Concern for Personal Safety from Crime

Discrimination Perceived by Immigrants	Concern for Personal Safety from Crime				Total (%)
	Satisfied or very satisfied		Dissatisfied or very dissatisfied		
	N	%	N	%	
Never been discriminated against	5181	83.1	509	67.0	5216 (81.4)
Ever been discriminated against in one or more incidences	1057	16.9	251	33.0	1192 (18.6)
Total	6238	100.0	760	100.0	6998 (100)

Note: $\chi^2 = 68.868$, $df=1$, $P \leq 0.001$. Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

Table 4.12 Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square test of Significance for perceived Discrimination with Protective Actions Taken out of Fear of Crime in the last 12 Months

Discrimination Perceived by Immigrants	Protective Actions Taken out of Fear of Crime				Total (%)
	No		Yes		
	N	%	N	%	
Never been discriminated against	5050	82.9	697	71.4	5747 (81.3)
Ever been discriminated against in one or more incidences	1043	17.1	279	28.6	1322 (18.7)
Total	6093	100.0	976	100.0	7069 (100)

Note: $\chi^2 = 72.769$, $df=1$, $P \leq 0.001$. Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

4.1.4 Results of Multivariate Analyses

To determine the influence of socio-demographic and other on perceived discrimination among immigrants, eight multivariate logistic regression models were run. Tables 4.13 through 4.15 illustrate the odds ratios for all multivariate logistic regression analyses with perceived discrimination as the dependent variable. The first model was run with all independent variables with racialized and the second model was run with non-racialized immigrants to see if any of them had an influence on perceived discrimination. Model 1 and 2 can be found in Table 4.13. The variables included in all eight logistic regression models are sex, educational qualification, household languages, live in welcoming community, years living in Canada, age1, age2, age3, age4, neighbourhood crime increasing/decreasing, sense of belonging to community, trust in strangers, employment main activity during the past 12 months, protective actions taken out of fear of crime in the last 12 months, concern for personal safety from crime, population centres indicator, and disruptive neighbours' behavioural patterns. Models 3 through 8 were run with a single group of racialized immigrants at a time including six racialized groups of immigrants

which were South Asian, Chinese, African and Caribbean, Filipino/a, Latin American, and Middle Eastern immigrants. I could not run separate models for Southeast Asian, West Asian, Korean, or Japanese groups due to small sample sizes. Models 3, 4, and 5 can be found in Table 4.14 while models 6, 7, and 8 can be found in Table 4.15.

4.1.4.1 Racialized and Non-racialized Minority Immigrant Models Results

Table 4.13 shows the results of the logistic regressions for both racialized immigrants (Model 1) and non-racialized immigrants (Model 2). Models 1 and 2 were significant at $p < 0.001$, both models were a good fit, but neither was a strong fit, meaning that the variables I selected were not good predictors of perceived discrimination (For racialized immigrants' model, Hosmer and Lemeshow, chi-square = 14.6, $df = 8$, $p = 0.07$, and Pseudo R-square = 0.10, and for non-racialized immigrants' model, Hosmer and Lemeshow, chi-square = 7.1, $df = 8$ $p = 0.52$, and Pseudo R-square = 0.09.). The *pseudo R²* are 0.10 and 0.09 respectively which means that 10 percent of the variance in perceived discrimination among racialized immigrants can be explained by the predictor variables, while less than ten percent (9 percent) of the variance of dependent variable can be explained in the non-racialized immigrants' model.

Disruptive Neighbours

An index recording the presence of problems with neighbours (such as loud neighbours, people hanging out) was created. The results of Table 4.13 for both models show that racialized immigrants whose neighbours exhibited disruptive behavioural patterns are 1.9 ($p < 0.001$) times more likely to report perceived discrimination. The effect of disruptive neighbours on perception

of discrimination is also high among non-racialized immigrants at 1.8 times more likely (odds ratios = 1.78, $p < 0.001$).

Protective Actions Taken out of Fear of Crime

Those who take measures to protect themselves because they fear becoming victimized by crime are also more likely to perceive discrimination. For non-racialized immigrants, those who took protective actions against crime are slightly more likely (1.67, $p = 0.001$) to report discrimination than those who did not. For racialized immigrants, the effect of this variable is nearly as strong (1.67, $p < 0.001$).

Concern for Personal Safety

Those who fear that they are vulnerable to crime are more likely to report perceived discrimination. Among racialized immigrants, the effect of this variable is slightly higher (1.6, $p < 0.001$) than among non-racialized immigrants (1.5, $p < 0.05$), but the effect is strong for both groups.

Sense of Belonging to Community

Table 4.13 also shows that both visible and non-visible minority immigrants whose sense of belonging to the local community is somewhat weak or very weak are more likely to perceive discrimination than their more connected counterparts. Among both groups, those who have a weak sense of belonging are 1.5 times more likely (odds ratios = 1.53 and 1.53, $p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.01$) to perceive discrimination than their counterparts who have somewhat or very strong sense of belonging.

Perceived Neighbourhood Crime

Table 4.13 shows that both racialized and non-racialized immigrants perceive more discrimination when they live in neighbourhoods where crime is also perceived to be on the rise. The effect, however, is larger among non-racialized groups where those living in increasingly crime-prone neighbourhoods were 1.6 ($p < 0.001$) times more likely to report perceived discrimination compared to racialized minority immigrants living in similar neighbourhoods (odds ratio = 1.4, $p < 0.001$).

Living in a Welcoming Community

The results for model 2 also show that racialized immigrants who live in a welcoming community are 36 percent less likely (odds ratio = 0.64, $p < 0.01$) to perceive discrimination than their counterparts who live in a less welcoming community. This variable had no statistically significant influence on perceived discrimination among non-racialized immigrants.

Education

The odds of perceiving discrimination are marginally higher for the most highly educated immigrants, those with university degrees (1.05, $p < 0.05$). It means that those with university degrees are slightly more likely to report discrimination than those with lower levels of education. Education has no effect on perceived discrimination among non-racialized immigrants.

Age

The odds of reporting discrimination for non-racialized immigrants aged 25 to 34 years are the highest. They are twice as likely to report discrimination as the youngest group. Among non-racialized immigrants aged 35 to 44 years, they are one and a half times more likely to

perceive discrimination than others. Age has no statistically significant influence on the perception of discrimination for racialized immigrants.

Sex

The results of the logistic regression (Table 4.13) show that among non-visible minority/white immigrants females are 30 percent less likely (odds ratio = 0.70, $p < 0.01$) to perceive discrimination than their male counterparts. There is no sex difference in perceived discrimination among racialized immigrants.

The results of Table 4.13 show that household languages, number of years living in Canada, age group3, age group4, trust in strangers, employment main activities during the last 12 months, and population centres indicator variable had no statistically significant influence on perceived discrimination among both racialized and non-racialized immigrants.

Table 4.13 Odds Ratios of Predictor Variables on Perceived Discrimination of Immigrants

Predictor Variables	Model 1 (Racialized Minority)	Model 2 (Non- racialized Minority)
	Odds ratio	Odds ratio
Sex	1.01	0.70**
Educational qualification	1.05*	1.05
Household Languages	0.88	0.82
Living in a Welcoming Community	0.64**	0.73
Number of Years Living in Canada	0.85	0.99
Age Group1	1.05	2.02**
Age Group2	0.84	1.58*
Age Group3	1.13	1.46
Age Group4	0.83	1.37
Neighbourhood Crime Increasing/ decreasing	1.39***	1.59***
Sense of Belonging to Community	1.53***	1.53**
Trust in Strangers	0.95	1.01
Employment main activities during the last 12 Months	1.03	0.97
Protective Actions Taken out of Fear of Crime Last 12 Months	1.60***	1.67***
Concern for Personal Safety from Crime	1.64***	1.47*
Population Centres Indicator	1.23	0.95
Disruptive Neighbour's Behavioural Pattern	1.89***	1.78***
⁵ Sample <i>n</i>		
Pseudo <i>R</i>²	0.10	0.09

⁵According to micro data file of GSS 2014, the sample size of immigrants is 7,090, and among these immigrants the sample size of visible minority and non-visible minority is 3,855 and 3,168 respectively. However, the sample size of master data file of GSS 2014 for these groups slightly differs. I am unable to report the exact sample size as Statistics Canada does not release unweighted sample size.

Source: General Social Survey, 2014, master data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author
***Significant at $P < 0.001$; **Significant at $P < 0.01$; *Significant at $P < 0.05$.

4.1.4.2 Is Perceived Discrimination Different for Various Racialized Groups of Immigrants?

Tables 4.14 and 4.15 present the results of logistic regressions in which 6 racialized groups of immigrants are studied separately to examine whether or not they perceive discrimination differently. Among these six models, only the Middle Eastern (Hosmer and Lemeshow, chi-square = 2.7, $df = 8$, $p = 0.95$, and Pseudo R-square = 0.21), South Asian (Hosmer and Lemeshow, chi-square = 11.3, $df = 8$, $p = 0.18$, and Pseudo R-square = 0.19), African and Caribbean (Hosmer and Lemeshow, chi-square = 6.6, $df = 8$, $p = 0.58$, and Pseudo R-square = 0.18), and Latin American (Hosmer and Lemeshow, chi-square = 7.6, $df = 8$, $p = 0.47$, and Pseudo R-square = 0.13) immigrants' models were statistically significant predictors of perceived discrimination. All four of these models were a good fit, but neither was a strong fit except Middle Eastern immigrants' model. The model fit for the Middle Eastern group is best at 21% of the variation explained. Basically, this is the only model that fulfills the minimum threshold of being statistically best fit as it can explain the 21% variances of dependent variable (perceived discrimination).

The models for Filipino/a (Hosmer and Lemeshow, chi-square = 7.2, $df = 8$, $p = 0.51$, and Pseudo R-square = 0.12) and Chinese (Hosmer and Lemeshow, chi-square = 4.3, $df = 8$, $p = 0.83$, and Pseudo R-square = 0.08) immigrants were also statistically significant, but had much lower goodness of fit.

Among the predictor variables for six racialized immigrants' models (Tables 4.14 and 4.15), disruptive neighbours' behavioural patterns came out as statistically significant for almost

all racialized groups i.e. Middle Eastern, South Asian, African and Caribbean, Latin American, and Chinese except Filipino/a immigrants.

The results also show that concern for personal safety was also statistically significant for South Asian and African and Caribbean immigrants only.

Tables 4.14 and 4.15 show that protective actions taken out of fear of crime in the last 12 months was a statistically significant predictor for South Asian, African and Caribbean, and Filipino/a immigrants only.

Among the other independent variables, neighbourhood's crime increasing/decreasing emerged as statistically significant only for Latin American immigrants; and sense of belonging to local community was statistically significant for Middle Eastern, and South Asian immigrants only; living in a welcoming community was statistically significant only for Filipino/a immigrants only. Educational qualification appeared as statistically significant only for African and Caribbean and Latin American immigrants; and employment main activities during the last 12 months came out as statistically significant only for Filipino/a immigrants.

Disruptive Neighbours

The results (Tables 4.14 and 4.15) of logistic regression analyses for these six groups of immigrants show that an index recording the presence of problems with neighbours (such as loud neighbours, people hanging out) was created. The results of Table 4.14 and 4.15 for the models of South Asian, Middle Eastern, and Chinese and show that racialized immigrants whose neighbours exhibited disruptive behavioural patterns are 2.7 ($p < 0.001$), 2.3 ($p < 0.01$), and 2.2 ($p < 0.001$) times more likely to report perceived discrimination. The effect of disruptive neighbours on perception of discrimination is also high among Latin American and African and

Caribbean immigrants at 1.8 and 1.7 times more likely (odds ratios = 1.8, $p < 0.05$ and 1.7, $p < 0.01$). This result was not statistically significant for Filipino/a immigrants.

Protective Actions Taken out of Fear of Crime

The results show that those who take measures to protect themselves because they fear becoming victimized by crime are also more likely to perceive discrimination. For African and Caribbean, South Asian, and Filipino/a immigrants, those who took protective actions against crime are 4, 2.1, and 2 times more likely (odds ratios = 3.9, $p < 0.001$, 2.1, $p < 0.01$, and 1.9, $p < 0.05$) to report discrimination than those who did not. This variable had no statistically significant effect on perceived discrimination among Middle Eastern, Latin American, and Chinese immigrants.

Concern for Personal Safety

The results of Tables 4.14 and 4.15 show that those who fear that they are vulnerable to crime are more likely to report perceived discrimination. Among the different racialized groups of immigrants, the effect of this variable for African and Caribbean immigrants is higher (2.5, $p < 0.01$) than among South Asian and Chinese immigrants (1.9, $p < 0.05$ and 1.8, $p < 0.05$), but the effect is strong for these three groups. This variable had no statistically significant influence on perceived discrimination among Middle Eastern, Latin American, and Filipino/a immigrants.

Perceived Neighbourhood Crime

The results of Tables 4.14 and 4.15 show that Latin American immigrants perceive more discrimination when they live in neighbourhoods where crime is also perceived to be on the rise. They were 1.8 ($p < 0.05$) times more likely to report perceived discrimination (odds ratio = 1.78,

p<0.05) compared to their counterparts who are living in neighbourhoods where crime is not perceived to be on the rise. This variable had no statistically significant influence on perceived discrimination among Middle Eastern, South Asian, African and Caribbean, Filipino/a, and Chinese immigrants.

Sense of Belonging to Community

Tables 4.14 and 4.15 also show that among various racialized groups of immigrants, Middle Eastern and South Asian immigrants whose sense of belonging to the local community is somewhat weak or very weak are more likely to perceive discrimination than their more connected counterparts. Among both groups, those who have a weak sense of belonging are 2.6 and 2.2 times more likely (odds ratios = 2.62, p<0.01 and 2.22, p<0.01) to perceive discrimination than their counterparts who have somewhat or very strong sense of belonging. This variable also had no statistically significant influence on perceived discrimination among African and Caribbean, Latin American, Filipino/a, and Chinese immigrants.

Living in a Welcoming Community

The results of Tables 4.14 and 4.15 show that Filipino/a immigrants who live in a welcoming community are 73 percent less likely (odds ratio = 0.27, p<0.01) to perceive discrimination than their counterparts who live in a less welcoming community. This variable had no statistically significant influence on perceived discrimination among Middle Eastern, South Asian, African and Caribbean, Latin American, and Chinese immigrants.

Education

The odds of perceiving discrimination are marginally higher for more university-educated Latin American and African and Caribbean immigrants (1.15, $p < 0.05$ and 1.13, $p < 0.05$), meaning those with university degrees are slightly more likely to report discrimination than those with lower levels of education. Education has no effect on perceived discrimination among Middle Eastern, South Asian, Filipino/a, and Chinese immigrants.

Employment Main Activity

Results of Tables 4.14 and 4.15 show that among Filipino/a immigrants, employed immigrants were 2.1 times more likely (odds ratio = 2.12, $p < 0.05$) to perceive discrimination than their immigrant counterparts who were unemployed or not in the labour market. This variable had no statistically significant influence on perceived discrimination among Middle Eastern, South Asian, African and Caribbean, Latin American, and Chinese immigrants.

The results of Tables 4.14 and 4.15 show that age, sex, household language, years living in Canada, trust in strangers, and population centres indicator variables had no statistically significant influence on perceived discrimination among these all six racialized groups of immigrants, i.e. Middle Eastern, South Asian, African and Caribbean, Latin American, Filipino/a, and Chinese immigrants.

Table 4.14 Odds Ratios of Predictor Variables on Perceived Discrimination of Immigrants i.e. Middle Eastern, South Asian, and African and Caribbean Immigrants

Predictor Variables	Model 3 (Middle Eastern Immi.)	Model 4 (South Asian Immi.)	Model 5 (African and Caribbean Immi.)
	Odds ratio	Odds ratio	Odds ratio
Sex	.66	1.07	1.08
Educational qualification	1.01	1.06	1.13*
Household Languages	.89	.80	1.48
Living in a Welcoming Community	1.45	.55	.63
Number of Years Living in Canada	.70	.75	.73
Age Group1	.73	1.42	.72
Age Group2	1.18	.67	.80
Age Group3	.86	1.05	.96
Age Group4	1.63	.57	.88
Neighbourhood Crime Increasing/ decreasing	1.78	1.21	1.31
Sense of Belonging to Community	2.62**	2.22**	1.23
Trust in Strangers	1.23	.81	.69
Employment main activities during the last 12 Months	1.28	1.41	.72
Protective actions taken out of fear of Crime Last 12 Months	.63	2.11**	3.97***
Concern for Personal Safety from Crime	2.05	1.87*	2.46**
Population Centres Indicator	.00	3.28	1.61
Disruptive Neighbours' Behavioural Pattern	2.33**	2.65***	1.74**

⁶Sample *n*

⁶ Due to restrictions from Statistics Canada, I am unable to release the N for each model. Every model, however, had an unweighted sample size of 400 people or greater.

Pseudo R² **0.21** **0.19** **0.18**

Source: General Social Survey, 2014, master data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author
 ***Significant at P<0.001; **Significant at P<0.01; *Significant at P<0.05.

Table 4.15 Odds Ratios of Predictor Variables on Perceived Discrimination of Immigrants i.e. Latin American, Filipino/a & Chinese Immigrants

Predictor Variables	Model 6 (Latin American Immi.)	Model 7 (Filipino/a Immi.)	Model 8 Chinese Immi.)
	Odds ratio	Odds ratio	Odds ratio
Sex	.90	.95	1.18
Educational qualification	1.15*	.99	1.01
Household Languages	1.25	.88	1.05
Living in a Welcoming Community	.67	.27**	.64
Number of Years Living in Canada	1.05	.76	1.06
Age Group1	1.28	.99	.70
Age Group2	.64	.61	1.15
Age Group3	1.04	.93	1.26
Age Group4	.67	.84	.99
Neighbourhood Crime Increasing/ decreasing	1.78*	1.67	1.19
Sense of Belonging to Community	1.22	1.26	1.28
Trust in Strangers	1.52	1.04	1.04
Employment main activities during the last 12 Months	1.19	2.12*	1.21
Protective actions taken out of fear of Crime in Last 12 Months	1.14	1.99*	1.48
Concern for Personal Safety from Crime	1.58	1.03	1.83*
Population Centres Indicator	2.13	.000	.00

Disruptive Neighbours' Behavioural Pattern	1.81*	1.38	2.24**
⁷ Sample <i>n</i>			
Pseudo <i>R</i> ²	0.13	0.12	0.08

Source: General Social Survey, 2014, master data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author
 ***Significant at $P < 0.001$; **Significant at $P < 0.01$; *Significant at $P < 0.05$.

⁷ Due to restrictions from Statistics Canada, I am unable to release the N for each model. Every model, however, had an unweighted sample size of 400 people or greater.

4.2 Discussion

The study explored some of the factors which influence perceived discrimination among immigrants. The study considered socio-demographic variables and other variables related to community life.

The results of bivariate analysis of the effect of racialized status on perceived discrimination reveal that racialized immigrants are more likely to perceive discrimination than non-racialized immigrants. This result supports the hypothesis that visible minority immigrants are more likely to perceive discrimination than their non-visible minority counterparts. This is not surprising given the vast number of studies revealing that racialized groups of immigrants experience discrimination in Canada. For example, the findings of Preston and her colleagues (2011), Oxman-Martinez and her colleagues (2012), Nangia (2013), Ray and Preston (2009), Reitz (2007), Dion and Kawakami (1996), and Taylor and his colleagues (1990) are identical with the findings of my study. Seaton and her colleagues (2008) in an American study also found similar findings. Esses and her colleagues (2007) also found that the discrimination faced by racialized immigrants is specific to their racialized minority status.

Immigrants whose neighbours exhibited disruptive behavioural patterns were more likely to perceive discrimination than their counterparts whose neighbours' behavioural patterns did not appear to be disruptive. This variable was statistically significant for almost all racialized groups of immigrants except for Filipino/a. This result supports the results of many studies. For example, Chiricos and his colleagues (2001), in an American study, showed that perceived risk of victimization is affected by the perception that whether Hispanics or African and Caribbean live nearby. Lewis and Maxfield (1980), in an American study, showed that the perceived risk among inhabitants is greatest where there is a combination of concern about crime and neighbourhood incivility. Vlaskamp

(2011), in her Master thesis in the Netherlands, showed that individuals living in neighbourhoods with high level of social disorder (consisting of social nuisance) are more likely to perceive fear of crime than people living in 'quiet' neighbourhoods. However, the only group in my study is the Filipino/a does not perceive discrimination because of disruptive neighbours' behavioural patterns. It might be the fact that Filipino/a live in a community where there was a greater cohesion among the community members allowing Filipino/a immigrants to enjoy equal facilities of social lives.

The variable of protective actions taken out of fear of crime in the last 12 months was significantly related to perceived discrimination for racialized (model 1) and non-racialized (model 2) immigrants. For non-racialized immigrants, those who took any type of protective actions against crime were slightly more likely to report discrimination than those who did not. For racialized immigrants, the effect of this variable is nearly as strong as non-racialized immigrants. This result was significant for three racialized groups of immigrants – African and Caribbean, South Asian, and Filipino/a immigrants. This variable had no statistically significant influence on perceived discrimination among Middle Eastern, Latin American, and Chinese immigrants. In a Canadian study, Hale (1996) shows that individuals/immigrants may increase spending to protect themselves from crime or may move away from a specific community because of a sense of insecurity. Theall and her associates (2009), in an American study, showed that male, single respondents, the respondents who lived with a substance user were more likely to respond to fear with protective actions than their counterparts respectively.

Dissatisfaction or high dissatisfaction concerning for personal safety because of crime was a statistically significant predictor for racialized (model 1) and non-racialized (model 2) immigrants. Immigrants who were more concerned about their personal safety were more likely

to perceive discrimination than their counterparts who were satisfied or very satisfied in this regard. This finding also came out as statistically significant for three racialized groups of immigrants – African and Caribbean, South Asian, and Chinese immigrants only - while it was not significant for Filipino/a, Latin American, and Middle Eastern immigrants. Cobbina and her colleagues, (2008) shows that a perceived lack of satisfaction with safety might have different kinds of negative effects on individuals/immigrants and communities, for example, immigrants may withdraw from collective/community life out of fear of crime or lack of safety and this situation may erode social cohesion. Adams and Serpe (2000), Lorenc and her associates (2012) and Foster and his colleagues' (2014) findings show that dissatisfaction with personal safety or a sense of insecurity may pose negative impacts on individuals/immigrants' mental, physical soundness as well as overall well-being.

The relationship between perception of increasing crime in their neighbourhood and perceived discrimination was statistically significant only for racialized immigrants (model 1) and non-racialized immigrants (model 2). When separate countries were examined, this relationship disappeared. Immigrants who live in a neighbourhood in which the trend of crime is perceived to be increasing are more likely to perceive discrimination than their counterparts who live in a less crime prone neighbourhood. Among different racialized groups of immigrants, this result was statistically significant only for Latin American immigrants and not for the other five racialized groups of immigrants. The results mean that among some racialized immigrants, living in a neighbourhood that they feel is unsafe likely heightens their perception of being discriminated against due to their race. Although there is no previous study based on this issue directly, but there are some studies that also found a sort of same kind of results. For instance, Hartnagel (1979) showed in a Canadian study that the respondents who were more fearful of

crime were less satisfied with their neighbourhood and the locality as places to live. Lewis and Maxfield (1980) in their study found that there is a relationship between the high levels of incivility and residents' perceptions of crime in their respective neighbourhood. Hartinger-Saunders (2012) also found that neighbourhood crime and perception of safety had a significant effect on vicarious victimization by exposure to violence in the neighbourhood. Kazemipur and Halli (2000) showed a relationship in a Canadian study, between the rising of poverty levels among the inhabitants, especially among immigrants, and the rise of various types of social problems, for example, poor educational and health care services, high crime, and high rate of unemployment. Swaroop and Krysan (2011), in an American study, also showed that racial proxy aspect applies weakly to whites' satisfaction; whites express less satisfaction in neighbourhoods with a large number of racialized residents, but it applied more strongly to African and Caribbean's and Latinos' satisfaction than to other ethnic groups. In some situations, particularly for Latinos, higher levels of satisfaction in integrated neighbourhoods can be attributed to the fact that these neighbourhoods have better socioeconomic conditions and lesser extent of social problems than predominantly minority communities (Swaroop and Krysan, 2011).

The results also confirm that sense of belonging to local community was statistically significant for racialized (model 1) and non-racialized (model 2) immigrants. Immigrants who have a somewhat weak or very weak sense of belonging to the local community are more likely to perceive discrimination than their counterparts who have somewhat strong or very strong sense of belonging. Among various racialized groups of immigrants, this result was significant only among South Asian and Middle Eastern immigrants. My result is consistent with some of previous studies. For instance, Reitz and Banerjee (2007) show that perception/experience of

discrimination as well as the loose of ties among the relations during immigration decrease sense of belonging to Canada. This is consistent with the finding of Huot and his associates (2014) that the stronger or weaker sense of belonging plays a crucial role in determining the level of perceived discrimination and feelings of exclusion.

The logistic regression analyses reveal that living in a welcoming community was statistically significant for racialized immigrants (model 1) and Filipino/a immigrants (model 7). Overall, immigrants, who live in a welcoming community, are less likely to perceive discrimination than their counterparts who live in a less welcoming community although the relationship is relatively weak and were significant only for racialized minority and Filipino/a immigrants. My result also supports those of previous studies. Radford's (2008) study showed that racialized minority populations, irrespective of their immigrant or generational status, are more likely to experience difficulty. Furthermore, Radford's study found that in cities where there is a large number of immigrants and racialized minority heterogeneity, racialized populations are more likely to report negative experiences and face greater hardship. Wu and his colleagues (2012) showed that immigrant generation status has a statistically significant effect on feelings of discomfort living in the host. They showed that first generation immigrants are more likely to report discomfort due to ethnic group affiliation and culture than third generation Canadians. Second generation Canadians are also less likely to report discomfort than first generation immigrants. Nakamura and her colleagues (2013) showed that Asian Canadian men who have sex with men experience the disadvantages because of being ethnic minorities as well as holding a stigmatized identity in their ethnic community. Together, these twin forces increase their social isolation and might obstruct their access to resources from in both the gay community and the ethnic community. As a result, MSM experience discrimination and this

might make it challenging to develop positive self-identity and might leave Asian MSM feeling isolated and without support. Almeida and her associates (2016) examined anti-immigration policies and experience of discrimination and found that anti-immigrant policies pave the way for stigmatizing both foreign and US-born Latinos by creating a hostile social environment/a less welcoming community which affects their experiences of discrimination.

The findings show that more university-educated immigrants are more likely to perceive discrimination than their less educated immigrant counterparts among those who are racialized (model 1), African and Caribbean (model 5) or Latin American (model 6). The relationship between educational qualification and perceived discrimination is very small as the odds ratios are almost all the same and most are not statistically significant. My result is consistent with some of previous studies. For instance, Preston and her colleagues (2011) found that immigrants with post-secondary education are more likely to report workplace discrimination than their counterparts who are less educated. Abramson and his associates (2015) also found in an American study that non- white immigrants with increasing levels of education are more likely to perceive discrimination. André and her associates (2008), in a working paper on immigrants from 14 European Union countries, found that immigrants with higher educational achievement have a positive effect on perceived discrimination. Daldy and her colleagues (2013), in a study of New Zealand, also found that the higher educated immigrants are more likely to report discrimination than their less educated counterpart immigrants. Steinmann (2018), in a German study, found that there is a positive relationship between educational attainment and perceived discrimination although it requires slightly different explanations for Polish and Turkish immigrants. It might be the fact that to be a higher educated person someone needs to stay longer period of time in the educational system. So, to be employed or participating in the educational

system increase the chance of interacting with majority member colleagues, customers, or students, which, consequently, paves the way for making immigrants more vulnerable to discrimination (Steinmann, 2018).

The variable of employment main activities during the last 12 months was statistically significant for Filipino/a immigrants only. The result indicates that among Filipino/a immigrants, employed immigrants were more likely to perceive discrimination than their immigrant counterparts who were unemployed or not in the labour market. However, this variable had no statistically significant influence on perceived discrimination among Middle Eastern, South Asian, African and Caribbean, and Chinese immigrants. My result is consistent with some of previous studies. For example, Nangia's (2013) study based on GSS 2009 data showed that 56 percent of immigrants reported the experience of discrimination at work compared to 44 percent of all non-immigrant Canadians. Daldy and her colleagues (2013), in a study of New Zealand, also found that employed immigrants are more likely than New Zealand –born employees to experience discrimination in the work place. Contrary to my result, André and her associates (2008), in a working paper on immigrants from 14 European Union countries, found that unemployment is associated with higher levels of perceived discrimination among immigrants.

Almost none of the models shows a significant relationship between gender and perceived discrimination among immigrants to Canada. The only exception is for non-visible minority immigrants (model 2). Among non-racialized immigrants, females are less likely to perceive discrimination than their white male counterparts which does not support my hypothesis. My results are aligned with Preston and her colleagues' (2011) findings that male immigrants are slightly more likely to perceive discrimination than their female immigrant counterparts. Seaton and her colleagues (2008) in an American study also found similar finding

that African American and Caribbean black males are more likely to perceive discrimination than their female counterparts.

Age only had an influence on perceived discrimination among those aged 25 to 44 years old who are not racialized, but the effect was small. My result partially supports the results of some previous studies. For instance, Garstka and her colleagues (2005), in an American study, found that young and older adults are likely to perceive age discrimination than middle-aged adults irrespective of comparison type. Gee and his associates (2007), in an American study, also found that perceived age discrimination is high in the 20s, but drops in the 30s and reaches at peak in the 50s.

None of the models in my study shows a statistically significant effect of number of years living in Canada on predicting perceived discrimination among immigrants and thus my hypothesis must be rejected. Although none of my study models found any statistically significant relationship between number of years of residence and perceived discrimination among immigrants, some studies found relationship between these two variables. For example, Briones and her colleagues (2012) showed that length of residence was negatively related with perceived discrimination in both Moroccan and Ecuadorean immigrants in Spain. This might indicate that since adolescents adapt themselves more with time to the host society, they are discriminated against less. Adolescents become gradually adept in language over time; gain more knowledge regarding host society's norms, values and practices; as well as frequent contacts with native Spaniards will probably contribute to a more positive reaction of the mainstream society and a more qualified interpretation of these reactions (Briones et al., 2012). Brondolo and her colleagues (2015) found an opposite result that a number of years of residence in the U.S. were positively connected with higher levels of perceived discrimination among immigrants.

Mossakowski and her colleagues (2017) found a sort of similar finding that there is a relationship between everyday discrimination and higher levels of psychological distress particularly among those who have lived in Hawai'i a longer period of time.

4.3 Conclusion

This chapter presents the results of the univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analyses. The results of bivariate analyses confirm that racialized minority immigrants perceive more discrimination than non-racialized immigrants. The results of logistic regression analyses confirm that disruptive neighbours' behavioural pattern, protective actions taken out of fear of crime in the last 12 months, concern for personal safety from crime, neighbourhood's crime increasing/decreasing, sense of belonging to community, and living in a welcoming community help to predict perceived discrimination. The next chapter discusses the conclusion, contribution to the knowledge of discrimination against immigrants to Canada and future research.

Chapter Five

Conclusion and Contribution To The Knowledge Of Discrimination Against Immigrants

5.1 Conclusion

Although Canada welcomes over 300,000 immigrants and nearly 500,000 international students and another 700,000 temporary workers annually, there is no doubt that racism and discrimination remain serious problems in Canada. My research joins the very sizable existing research indicating that racialized immigrants perceive more discrimination after entering than their white counterparts. This is discouraging, but hardly surprising. The bivariate analysis of this study confirm that, irrespective of age, sex, educational qualification, number of years living in Canada, or the household language used, racialized immigrants are more likely to perceive discrimination than their white counterparts. However, unlike other findings on discrimination, I found that the community level indicators such as presence of disruptive neighbours, living in a neighbourhood where crime is increasing, concern for personal safety from crime, protective actions taken out of fear of crime, sense of belonging to community, and the nature of community have a greater effect on perceived discrimination among immigrants than ascribed characteristics (sex, age, household languages, and number of years living in Canada). This means that researchers need to take the community level variables, which were missing in the previous studies done by other researchers, into account to understand the level of perceived discrimination among immigrants. These community level variables are related to maintaining a quality of life for population in a community or society of any given country. As a result, if neighbourhood crime and disruptive neighbours' behavioural patterns are perceived to be problematic, immigrants/respondents perceive more discrimination. Moreover, this kind of neighbourhood and neighbours' disruptive behaviours might make the community less

welcoming for immigrants especially for racialized immigrants. Immigrants/respondents might not feel safe and, therefore, they might take various protective actions because of fear of crime. Consequently, these situations might weaken the sense of belonging to the community and hence immigrants perceive more discrimination than their counterparts who did not have to experience these types of problems. The findings of logistic regression analyses regarding the community level indicators help us to understand fully that immigrants not only perceive discrimination for the ascribed characteristics but also they perceive discrimination because of these community level indicators. As this study uses the up-to-date national data and has a large sample size, the results should be generalizable to Canada's immigrant population. Therefore, if the Canadian government or the competent departments take necessary measures to address these issues, immigrants/respondents especially racialized immigrants' experience of discrimination might decrease gradually.

5.2 Contribution of the Study to Our Knowledge of Discrimination Against Immigrants

The present study contributes to the knowledge of discrimination against immigrants in a way that my study has revealed that along with ascribed characteristics (such as age, sex, household languages, and number of years living in Canada) community level indicators also play a very significant role in perceiving discrimination among immigrants to Canada. The study confirms that disruptive neighbours' behavioural patterns, living in a neighbourhood where crime is increasing, concern for personal safety from crime, protective actions taken out of fear of crime, sense of belonging to community, and the nature of community have emerged as important predictors what the other studies have left out. Therefore, it is now clear that

immigrants, especially racialized immigrants not only perceive discrimination because of ascribed characteristics but also for community level indicators.

The findings of the study also confirm that discrimination remains a problem for immigrants- which are highly discouraging in 21st century Canada. Having a multicultural act has not helped either. In this climate of increased discrimination and unchecked racism among some elected leaders and other socially important people is the real problem right now.

5.3 Future Research

The findings of this study suggest that future research needs to examine more closely the influence of neighbourhood and other social level variables, what other studies have left out, on perceived discrimination. Furthermore, the findings of the present study indicate that I need larger samples of my subpopulations so that I can look at Koreans, Southeast Asian, West Asian, Japanese, and countries within Africa separately.

References

- Abedi, M. (2017). "Canada is 150 and Still Needs to Face its Racism Problem: Advocates." Global News. Retrieved online on September 20, 2018 from <https://globalnews.ca/news/3556823/racism-in-canada/>
- Aboubacar, S. A., & Zhu, N. (2013). Episodes of non-employment among immigrants from developing countries in Canada. *Canadian Studies in Population*, 40(1–2), 9–22. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272305340_Episodes_of_Non-Employment_Among_Immigrants_to_Canada_from_Developing_Countries
- Abramson, C. M., Hashemi, M., & Sánchez-Jankowski, M. (2015). Perceived discrimination in US healthcare: charting the effects of key social characteristics within and across racial groups. *Preventive medicine reports*, 2, 615-621. Retrieved on October 16, 2018 from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2211335515000972>
- Abu-Laban, Y. & Gabriel, C. (2002). *Selling Diversity: Immigration, Multiculturalism, Employment Equity, and Globalization*. Ontario, ON: Broadview Press.
- Adams, R. E., & Serpe, R. T. (2000). Social integration, fear of crime, and life satisfaction. *Sociological perspectives*, 43(4), 605-629. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1389550>
- Almeida, J., Biello, K. B., Pedraza, F., Wintner, S., & Viruell-Fuentes, E. (2016). The association between anti-immigrant policies and perceived discrimination among Latinos in the US: A multilevel analysis. *SSM-population health*, 2, 897-903. Retrieved on October 13, 2018 from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29349196>
- André, S., Dronkers, J., & Fleischmann, F. (2008, May). The Different Levels of Discrimination, experienced by First and Second Generation Immigrants from Different Countries of Origin in the different EU member-states. In *Proceesings of the RC28 Spring Meeting*,

- Florence, Italy* (pp. 15-18). Retrieved on October 3, 2018 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228465839_The_Different_Levels_of_Discrimination_experienced_by_First_and_Second_Generation_Immigrants_from_Different_Countries_of_Origin_in_the_different_EU_member-
- Badets, J., Chard, J., & Levett, A. (2003). *Ethnic Diversity Survey: Portrait of a multicultural society*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Catalogue No. 89-593-XIE. Retrieved from <http://publications.gc.ca/Collection/Statcan/89-593-X/89-593-XIE2003001.pdf>
- Berry, J. W., & Hou, F. (2017). Acculturation, discrimination and wellbeing among second generation of immigrants in Canada. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 61(March), 29–39. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2017.08.003>
- Berry, J. W., & Kalin, R. (1995). Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991 National Survey. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 27(3), 301-320. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0008-400X.27.3.301>
- Biles, J. (2008). Integration policies in english speaking Canada. In J. Biles, M. Burstein & J. Frideres (Eds.), *Immigration and integration in Canada in the twenty-first century* (pp. 139-186). Retrieved from https://www.riir.ulaval.ca/sites/riir.ulaval.ca/files/2010_65-2_2_0.pdf
- Blank, R. M., Dabady, M. & Citro, C. F. (2004). *Measuring Racial Discrimination*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved on December 15, 2017 from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com/uml.idm.oclc.org/ehost/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=b9d9b1f3-972e-4e72-9917-00b1df1545cf%40pdc-v-ssesmrg01&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWwhvc3QtG12ZQ%3d%3d#AN=114125&db=nlebk>

- Bonikowska, A., Hou, F., & Picot, G. (2011). Do Highly Educated Immigrants Perform Differently in the Canadian and US Labour Markets? Cat. NO. 11F0019M No. 329. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Retrieved from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/11f0019m/11f0019m2011329-eng.pdf>
- Borjas, G. J. (1987). Immigrants, minorities, and labor market competition. *ILR Review*, 40(3), 382-392. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/001979398704000305>
- Brettell, C. B. (2011). Experiencing everyday discrimination: A comparison across five immigrant populations. *Race and Social Problems*, 3(4), 266-279. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs12552-011-9055-1>
- Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R. R., Pugh, S. D., & Vaslow, J. B. (2000). Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 81(1), 72-97. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10631069>
- Briones, E., Verkuyten, M., Cosano, J., & Tabernero, C. (2012). Psychological adaptation of Moroccan and Ecuadorean immigrant adolescents in Spain. *International Journal of Psychology*, 47(1), 28-38. Retrieved on October 15, 2018 from <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/doi/full/10.1080/00207594.2011.569722>
- Brondolo, E., Rahim, R., Grimaldi, S. J., Ashraf, A., Bui, N., & Schwartz, J. C. (2015). Place of birth effects on self-reported discrimination: Variations by type of discrimination. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 49, 212-222. Retrieved on October 16, 2018 from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5026226/>

Brym, R. J., Roberts, L. W., Lie, J. & Rytina, S. (2013). *Sociology: Your Compass for a New World*. Toronto: Nelson Education Ltd.

Buzdugan, R., & Halli, S. S. (2009). Labor Market Experiences of Canadian Immigrants with Focus on Foreign Education and Experience. *International Migration Review*, 43(2), 366-386. Retrieved from https://www-jstor-org.uml.idm.oclc.org/stable/20681709?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

Cavalli-Sforza, L. L., P. Menozzi, and A. Piazza. (1994). *The History and Geography of Human Genes*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/225035554_The_History_and_Geography_of_Human_Gene

Chiricos, T., McEntire, R., & Gertz, M. (2001). Perceived racial and ethnic composition of neighborhood and perceived risk of crime. *Social Problems*, 48(3), 322-340. Retrieved on October 8, 2018 from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2001.48.3.322>

Chow, H.P.H. (2007). Sense of belonging and life satisfaction among Hong Kong adolescent immigrants in Canada. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33(3):511–520. Retrieved on October 14, 2017 from <https://www-tandfonline-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/doi/abs/10.1080/13691830701234830>

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2006). Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration. Retrieved on March 30, 2017 from http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/pdf/pub/immigration2006_e.pdf

Clark, E. M. (2014). Sociological theories of low-wage work. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 24(1), 38-50. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10911359.2014.844601>

- Cobbina, J. E., Miller, J., & Brunson, R. K. (2008). Gender, neighborhood danger, and risk-avoidance strategies among urban African-American youths. *Criminology*, 46(3), 673-709. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2008.00122.x>
- Crockett, D., Grier, S. A., & Williams, J. A. (2003). Coping with marketplace discrimination: An exploration of the experiences of black men. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 2003(4), 1–21 [WWW page]. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/crockett04-2003.pdf>
- Daldy, B., Poot, J., & Roskrug, M. J. (2013). Perception of workplace discrimination among immigrants and native born New Zealanders. Retrieved on October 14, 2018 from <https://businesslaw.curtin.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2016/04/AJLE-v16n1-Daldy-1.pdf>
- Dion, K. L., & Kawakami, K. (1996). Ethnicity and perceived discrimination in Toronto: Another look at the personal/group discrimination discrepancy. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 28, 203–213. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0008-400X.28.3.203>
- Dungan, P., Fang, T., & Gunderson, M. (2013). Macroeconomic Impacts of Canadian Immigration: Results from a Macro Model. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 51(1), 174–195. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8543.2012.00905.x>
- Edge, S., & Newbold, B. (2013). Discrimination and the health of immigrants and refugees: exploring Canada's evidence base and directions for future research in newcomer receiving countries. *Journal of immigrant and minority health*, 15(1), 141-148. Retrieved from <https://link-springer-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/article/10.1007/s10903-012-9640-4>
- Esses, V. M., Dietz, J., Bennett-Abuayyash, C., & Joshi, C. (2007). Prejudice in the workplace: The role of bias against visible minorities in the devaluation of immigrants' foreign-

- acquired qualifications and credentials. *Canadian Issues*, Spring: 114-118. Retrieved on August 7, 2017 from https://search-proquest-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/docview/208677197?rfr_id=info%3Axri%2Fsid%3Aprimo
- Esses, V. M., Dietz, J., & Bhardwaj, A. (2006). The role of prejudice in the discounting of immigrant skills. *Cultural psychology of immigrants*, 113-130. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/15188147/The_role_of_prejudice_in_the_discounting_of_immigrant_skills
- Foster, S., Knuiman, M., Hooper, P., Christian, H., & Giles-Corti, B. (2014). Do changes in residents' fear of crime impact their walking? Longitudinal results from reside. *Preventive medicine*, 62, 161-166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.02.011>
- Garstka, T. A., Hummert, M. L., & Branscombe, N. R. (2005). Perceiving age discrimination in response to intergenerational inequity. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61(2), 321-342. Retrieved on October 14, 2018 from <https://spssi-onlinelibrary-wiley-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/doi/full/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00408.x>
- Gee, G. C., Pavalko, E. K., & Long, J. S. (2007). Age, cohort and perceived age discrimination: using the life course to assess self-reported age discrimination. *Social Forces*, 86(1), 265-290. Retrieved on October 14, 2018 from https://www-jstor-org.uml.idm.oclc.org/stable/4495036?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Gfellner, Barbara M. (2015). Ethnic identity as a protective resource for discrimination among North American Indians: A comparison with mainstream adults in Canada. In Warner, A. D. (Ed.), *Ethnic and Cultural Identity*. Nova Science Publishers, Inc. Retrieved from https://novapublishers.com/catalog/product_info.php?products_id=56207

- General Social Survey, Cycle 28, 2014. (2017). Victimization Main File, Statistics Canada. Ottawa: Canada. Retrieved from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/catalogue/12M0026X2016001>
- Gilmore, J., & Gilmore, J. (2009). *The 2008 Canadian immigrant labour market: analysis of quality of employment*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, Labour Statistics Division. Catalogue no. 71-606-X, no. 5. Retrieved from <http://www.deslibris.ca.uml.idm.oclc.org/ID/220431>
- Hagerty, B. M., Lynch-Sauer, J., Patusky, K. L., Bouwsema, M., & Collier, P. (1992). Sense of belonging: a vital mental health concept. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 6(3), 172–177. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/28c4/1fed7c49a0a8ed1c6c3a31b2bafd09bd538c.pdf>
- Hale, C. (1996). Fear of crime: A review of the literature. *International review of Victimology*, 4(2), 79-150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026975809600400201>
- Harman, V. (2010). Experiences of racism and the changing nature of white privilege among lone white mothers of mixed-parentage children in the UK. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33(2), 176-194. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01419870903023652>
- Harrell, S. P., & Sloan-Pena, G. (2006). Racism and discrimination. In Jackson, Y. (2006). *Encyclopedia of Multicultural Psychology*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications, Inc. Retrieved from <http://uml.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=474288&site=ehost-live>
- Hartinger-Saunders, R. M., Rine, C. M., Nochajski, T., & Wieczorek, W. (2012). Neighborhood crime and perception of safety as predictors of victimization and offending among youth:

- A call for macro-level prevention and intervention models. *Children and youth services review*, 34(9), 1966-1973. Retrieved on October 11, 2018 from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3462468/>
- Hartnagel, T. F. (1979). The perception and fear of crime: Implications for neighborhood cohesion, social activity, and community affect. *Social forces*, 58(1),176-193. Retrieved on October 9, 2018 from <https://academic.oup.com/sf/article-abstract/58/1/176/2230880?redirectedFrom=fulltext>
- Hawthorne, L. (2008). *The impact of economic selection policy on labour market outcomes for degree-qualified migrants in Canada and Australia*. IRPP. Retrieved from <http://deslibris.ca/ID/213112>
- Hosoda, M., & Stone-Romero, E. (2010). The effects of foreign accents on employment-related decisions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(2), 113-132.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.uuml.idm.oclc.org/10.1108/02683941011019339>
- Houle, R., & Yssaad, L. (2010). Recognition of newcomers' foreign credentials and work experience. *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, 22(4), 19-34. Retrieved from <http://uuml.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.uuml.idm.oclc.org/docview/856398331?accountid=14569>
- Huot, S., Dodson, B., & Laliberte Rudman, D. (2014). Negotiating belonging following migration: exploring the relationship between place and identity in Francophone minority communities. *The Canadian Geographer*, 58(3), 329–340. <https://doi-org.uuml.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/cag.12067>
- Jackson, J. S., Brown, K. T., & Kirby, D. C. (1998). International perspectives on prejudice and racism. In J. L. Eberhardt & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *Confronting racism: The problem and the*

- response* (pp. 101-135). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/record/1998-07453-005>
- Jantzen, L. (2015). Do economic principal applicants work in their intended regulated occupation? Introducing the national household survey and immigration landing file linkage database. *Canadian Public Policy*, 41(Supplement 1), S48-S63. <https://www.utpjournals.press/doi/abs/10.3138/cpp.2015-010>
- Jedwab, J & Satzewich, V. (2015). Introduction: Context and Reception. In John Porter, *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social and Power in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Retrieved from <http://books1.scholarsportal.info.uml.idm.oclc.org/viewdoc.html?id=/ebooks/ebooks3/utpress/2015-06-02/1/9781442624290>
- Kazemipur, A., & Halli, S. (2000). The invisible barrier: Neighbourhood poverty and integration of immigrants in Canada. *Journal of International Migration and Integration/Revue de l'integration et de la migration internationale*, 1(1), 85-100. Retrieved on October 7, 2018 from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12134-000-1009-1>
- Klinner, N. S., & Walsh, G. (2013). Customer perceptions of discrimination in service deliveries: Construction and validation of a measurement instrument. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(5), 651-658. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0148296312001865>
- Kobayashi, A. & Johnson, G. F. (2007). Introduction. In Johnson, Genevieve Fuji, and Randy Enomoto (Eds.), *Genevieve Fuji, Race, Recialization, and Antiracism in Canada and Beyond*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Retrieved from <https://books.google.ca/books?hl=en&lr=&id=He1168mzgt4C&oi=fnd&pg=PT4&dq=Ko>

- bayashi,+A.+%26+Johnson,+G.+F.+(2007).+Introduction.+In+Enomoto,+Randy+%26+Johnson,+Genevieve+Fuji,+Race,+Reacialization,+and+Antiracism+in+Canada+and+Beyo
nd&ots=jnQHwnHkwb&sig=rtq4gE-WI2bIIZ66cZKbGygxM4Y#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Kustec, S. (2012). *The role of migrant labour supply in the Canadian labour market*. Ottawa: Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.amssa.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/The-Role-of-migrant-labour-supply-in-the-Canadian-labour-market.pdf>
- Lewis, D. A., & Maxfield, M. G. (1980). Fear in the neighborhoods: An investigation of the impact of crime. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 17(2), 160-189. Retrieved on October 7, 2018 from <http://journals.sagepub.com.uml.idm.oclc.org/doi/pdf/10.1177/002242788001700203>
- Li, P. S. (2003). *Destination Canada: Immigration Debates and Issues*. Ontario, Canada: Oxford University Press.
- Li, P. S. (2003). Initial earnings and catch-up capacity of immigrants. *Canadian Public Policy/Analyse de Politiques*, 319-337. Retrieved from https://www-jstor-org.uml.idm.oclc.org/stable/3552289?sid=primo&origin=crossref&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Li, P. S. (2001). The market worth of immigrants' educational credentials. *Canadian Public Policy/Analyse de Politiques*, 23-38. Retrieved from https://www-jstor-org.uml.idm.oclc.org/stable/3552371?sid=primo&origin=crossref&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Li, P. S. (2000). Earning disparities between immigrants and native-born Canadians. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie*, 37(3), 289-311.

<https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1755-618X.2000.tb00592.x>

- Lorenc, T., Clayton, S., Neary, D., Whitehead, M., Petticrew, M., Thomson, H., ... & Renton, A. (2012). Crime, fear of crime, environment, and mental health and wellbeing: mapping review of theories and causal pathways. *Health & place, 18*(4), 757-765. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2012.04.001>
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality* (1st ed.). New York: Harper. Retrieved from <http://www.worldcat.org/title/motivation-and-personality/oclc/170747>
- Massey, D.S. (1990). American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass. *American Journal of Sociology 96*(2):329–357. Retrieved from https://www-jstor-org.uml.idm.oclc.org/stable/2781105?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Mcginnity, F., O'Connell, P. J., Quinn, E., & Williams, J. (2006). Migrants' Experience of Racism and Discrimination in Ireland: Survey Report. *Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI) Research Series*. Dublin: ESRI. Retrieved from <https://www.esri.ie/publications/migrants-experience-of-racism-and-discrimination-in-ireland-survey-report/>
- Mossakowski, K. N., Wongkaren, T., & Uperesa, F. L. (2017). It is not Black and White: Discrimination and distress in Hawai 'i. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 23*(4), 551. Retrieved on October 16, 2018 from <http://psycnet.apa.org/record/2017-10896-001>
- Nakamura, N., Chan, E., & Fischer, B. (2013). “Hard to crack”: Experiences of community integration among first-and second-generation Asian MSM in Canada. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 19*(3), 248. Retrieved on October 13, 2018 from

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23875850>

Nangia, P. (2013). *Discrimination experienced by landed immigrants in Canada*. Ryerson Centre for Immigration & Settlement. RCIS Working Paper. Retrieved on March, 10, 2015 from https://www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/.../RCIS_WP_Parveen_Nangia_No_2013_7.pdf

Nangia, P. (2012). Immigration and Settlement in Greater Sudbury. *Immigration, Integration, and Inclusion in Ontario Cities*, 253-277. Retrieved from <https://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/papers-2009/Nangia.pdf>

Oreopoulos, P. (2011). Why do skilled immigrants struggle in the labor market? A field experiment with thirteen thousand resumes. *American Economic Journal. Economic Policy*, 3(4), 148-171. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/pol.3.4.148>

Oreopoulos, P. (2009). *Why do skilled immigrants struggle in the labor market? A field experiment with six thousand resumes* (No. w15036). National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from <https://www.nber.org/papers/w15036>

Owusu, Y., & Sweetman, A. (2015). Regulated Health Professions: Outcomes by Place of Birth and Training. *Canadian Public Policy*, 41(Supplement 1), S98-S115. <https://www.utpjournals.press/doi/pdf/10.3138/cpp.2015-008>

Oxman-Martinez, J., Rummens, A. J., Moreau, J., Choi, Y. R., Beiser, M., Ogilvie, L., & Armstrong, R. (2012). Perceived ethnic discrimination and social exclusion: Newcomer immigrant children in Canada. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 82(3), 376-388. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1939-0025.2012.01161.x>

- Palameta, B. (2007). Economic integration of immigrants' children. *Perspectives on labour and income*, 19(4), 31. Retrieved from https://search-proquest-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/docview/58753445?rfr_id=info%3Axri%2Fsid%3Aprimo
- Pendakur, K., & Pendakur, R. (2010). Color by numbers: Minority earnings in Canada 1995–2005. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 12(3), 305-329. Retrieved from www.sfu.ca/~pendakur/Colour_By_Numbers.pdf
- Permanent Residents - Monthly IRCC Updates. (February 28, 2018). Statistics Canada. Ottawa: Canada. Retrieved from <https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/f7e5498e-0ad8-4417-85c9-9b8aff9b9eda>
- Perreault, S. (2017). Canadians' perceptions of personal safety and crime, 2014. *Juristat: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*, 1-35. Retrieved from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2017001/article/54889-eng.htm>
- Perreault, S. (2015). Criminal victimization in Canada, 2014. *Juristat. Statistics Canada Catalogue*, (85-002). Retrieved from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2015001/article/14241-eng.htm>
- Petersen, L.-E., & Dietz, J. (2005). Prejudice and Enforcement of Workforce Homogeneity as Explanations for Employment Discrimination. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35(1), 144-159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02097.x>
- Phythian, K., Walters, D., & Anisef, P. (2010). Predicting earnings among immigrants to Canada: the role of source country. *International Migration*, 49(6), 129-154. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-2435.2010.00626.x>

- Picot, W. G. (2008). *Immigrant economic and social outcomes in Canada: Research and data development at Statistics Canada*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Garnett_Picot/publication/23692080_Immigrant_Economic_and_Social_Outcomes_in_Canada_Research_and_Data_Development_at_Statistics_Canada/links/5756d38608ae05c1ec169904/Immigrant-Economic-and-Social-Outcomes-in-Canada-Research-and-Data-Development-at-Statistics-Canada.pdf
- Picot, G., & Sweetman, A. (2011). *Canadian Immigration Policy and Immigrant Economic Outcomes: Why the Differences in Outcomes between Sweden and Canada?* (No. 25). IZA Policy Paper. Retrieved from <http://ftp.iza.org/pp25.pdf>
- Picot, G., and A. Sweetman. (2005). *The Deteriorating Economic Welfare of Immigrants and Possible Causes: Update 2005*. Statistics Canada, Business and Labour Market Analysis Division. Statistics Canada Analytical Studies Branch Research Paper Cat. no. 11F0019MIE No. 262. Ottawa, ON. Retrieved from <http://www.deslibris.ca.uml.idm.oclc.org/ID/201041>
- Preston, V., Chua, J., Phan, M., Park, S., Kelly, P., & Lemoine, M. (2011). What are immigrants' experiences of discrimination in the workplace. *Toronto Immigrant Employment Data Initiative Analytical Report*. Retrieved on September 10, 2017 from <http://www.yorku.ca/tiedi/doc/AnalyticalReport21.pdf>
- Ray, B., & Preston, V. (2009). Geographies of discrimination: Variations in perceived discomfort and discrimination in Canada's gateway cities. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 7(3), 228-249. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15562940903150055>

- Seaton, E. K., Caldwell, C. H., Sellers, R. M., & Jackson, J. S. (2008). The prevalence of perceived discrimination among African American and Caribbean Black youth. *Developmental psychology*, 44(5), 1288. Retrieved on October 8, 2018 from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2556985/>
- Steinmann, J. P. (2018). The paradox of integration: why do higher educated new immigrants perceive more discrimination in Germany? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1-24. Retrieved on October 14, 2018 from <https://www-tandfonline-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/doi/abs/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1480359>
- Radford, P. (2008). *A statistical analysis of the immigrant and visible minority experience in Canada's cities and smaller communities: understanding the factors that impact social cohesion* (Doctoral dissertation, Concordia University). Retrieved on October 3, 2018 from <https://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/976005/>
- Raza, M., Beaujot, R., & Woldemicael, G. (2013). Social capital and economic integration of visible minority immigrants in Canada. *Journal of international migration and integration*, 14(2), 263-285. Retrieved from <https://link-springer-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/article/10.1007/s12134-012-0239-3>
- Reitz, J. G., & Banerjee, R. (2007). *Racial inequality, social cohesion and policy issues in Canada*. Canada: Institute for Research on Public Policy. Retrieved from irpp.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/reitz.pdf
- Reitz, J. G. (2007). Immigrant employment success in Canada, Part I: Individual and contextual causes. *Journal of International Migration and Integration/Revue de l'integration et de la migration internationale*, 8(1), 11-36. Retrieved from <https://link-springer-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/article/10.1007/s12134-007-0001-4>

- Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Gannon-Rowley, T. (2002). Assessing “neighborhood effects”: Social processes and new directions in research. *Annual review of sociology*, 28(1), 443-478. Retrieved on October 13, 2018 from <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.soc.28.110601.141114>
- Schellenberg, G. (2004, Winter). Perceptions of Canadians: A sense of belonging, confidence and trust. *Canadian Social Trends*, 16-21. Retrieved from <http://uml.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/docview/224104325?accountid=14569>
- Sonn, C. (2002). Immigrant adaptation: understanding the process through sense of community. In A. Fisher, C. Sonn, & B. Bishop (Eds.), *Psychological Sense of community research, applications and implications* (pp. 205–222). New York: Kluwer. Retrieved from <https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9780306472817>
- Statistics Canada. (2017). General Social Survey (GSS), Cycle 28, 2014- Victimization. Ottawa: Canada.
- Statistics Canada. (2017). Permanent Residents - Monthly IRCC Updates, Statistics Canada. Ottawa: Canada. Retrieved on Nov. 20, 2017 from <http://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/f7e5498e-0ad8-4417-85c9-9b8aff9b9eda>
- Statistics Canada. (2015). Visible minority of person. Statistics Canada. Ottawa: Canada. Retrieved on July 7, 2018 from <http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Var.pl?Function=DEC&Id=45152>
- Statistics Canada. (2005). Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada. Ottawa: Canada. Retrieved on April 09, 2017 from <http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SDDS=4422>

- Statistics Canada. (2013). *Population by Knowledge of Official Language, by Province and Territory (2011 Census)*. Retrieved from [http:// www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/101/cst01/demo15-eng.htm](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/101/cst01/demo15-eng.htm).
- Statistics Canada. (2008). "Earnings and Incomes of Canadians over the past Quarter Century, 2006 Census", Cat no. 97-563-X, Statistics Canada. Retrieved from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/catalogue/97-563-X>
- Swaroop, S., & Krysan, M. (2011). The determinants of neighborhood satisfaction: Racial proxy revisited. *Demography*, 48(3), 1203-1229. Retrieved on October 12, 2018 from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3694587/>
- Sweetman, A., McDonald, J. T., & Hawthorne, L. (2015). Occupational regulation and foreign qualification recognition: an overview. *Canadian Public Policy*, 41(Supplement 1), S1-S13. Retrieved from <https://www.utpjournals.press/doi/abs/10.3138/cpp.41.s1.s1>
- Taylor, D.M., Wright, S.C., Moghaddam, EM., & Lalonde, R.N. (1990). The personal/group discrepancy: Perceiving my group but not myself, to be a target of discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 16, 254-262. <https://doi-org.uml.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0146167290162006>
- Teixeira, C. (2006). Housing experiences of black africans in toronto's rental market: A case study of angolan and mozambican immigrants. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 38(3), 58-86. Retrieved from <http://uml.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/docview/215636471?accountid=14569>
- Theall, K. P., Sterk, C. E., & Elifson, K. W. (2009). Perceived neighborhood fear and drug use among young adults. *American journal of health behavior*, 33(4), 353-365. Retrieved on October 8, 2018 from

<http://go.galegroup.com.uml.idm.oclc.org/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA209477190&v=2.1&u=univmanitoba&it=r&p=HRCA&sw=w>

The Conference Board of Canada. (2016). "Immigrants is Critical to Canada' Prosperity." Retrieved on September 16, 2016 from <http://www.conferenceboard.ca/topics/immigration/default.aspx>

Turchick Hakak, L., Holzinger, I., & Zikic, J. (2010). Barriers and paths to success: Latin American MBAs' views of employment in Canada. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(2), 159-176. Retrieved from <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/02683941011019366>

Uppal, S., & LaRochelle-Côté, S. (2014). *Overqualification among recent university graduates in Canada*. Statistics Canada= Statistique Canada. Retrieved from http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2014/statcan/75-006-x/75-006-2014001-3-eng.pdf

Vlaskamp, C. (2011). "How safe do you feel in your own neighbourhood?" *A closer look at the fear of crime of individuals living in neighbourhoods in Roosendaal* (Master's thesis, University of Twente). Retrieved on October 7, 2018 from https://essay.utwente.nl/62705/1/How_safe_do_you_feel_in_your_own_neighbourhood_-_Carmen_Vlaskamp.pdf

Warman, C., Sweetman, A., & Goldmann, G. (2015). The portability of new immigrants' human capital: language, education, and occupational skills. *Canadian Public Policy*, 41(Supplement 1), S64-S79. Retrieved from <https://www.utpjournals.press/doi/abs/10.3138/cpp.2013-055>

- Wu, Z., Schimmele, C. M., & Hou, F. (2012). Self-perceived integration of immigrants and their children. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers Canadiens De Sociologie*, 37(4), 381-408. Retrieved from <http://uml.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/docview/1417527228?accountid=14569>
- Yoshida, Y., & Smith, M. R. (2008). Measuring and mismeasuring discrimination against visible minority immigrants: The role of work experience. *Canadian Studies in Population*, 35(2), 311-338. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25336/P6F62V>
- Ziegert, J. C., & Hanges, P. J. (2005). Employment Discrimination: The Role of Implicit Attitudes, Motivation, and a Climate for Racial Bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 553-562. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.553>
- Zietsma, D. (2010). Immigrants working in regulated occupations. *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, 22(1), 51-59. Retrieved from <http://uml.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/docview/213991399?accountid=14569>

Appendices

Appendix 1 Correlation matrix between Dependent and Predictor Variables

Table A.1 Correlations between Dependent and Predictor Variables⁸

⁸ Age and number of years living in Canada interact each other ($r = -.426^{**}$), and educational qualification & employment main activity during the past 12 months ($r = .323^{**}$) which indicate the multicollinearity issues. In relation to these two interactions, I have not corrected them which will cause the pseudo R-square to be inflated and may invalidate my results. I have spoken with my advisor about this and will deal with this problem in a different way should I try to publish this in a journal.. To deal with the interaction between visible minority status and age ($r = -0.416$), the study has developed two separate equations for both visible and non-visible minority immigrants separately to see whether the results vary or not..

Number of years living in Canada	.028*	.248**	-.426**	.028*	0.004	-					
Household languages	0.022	.216**	-.208**	0.015	-0.002	.196**	-				
Neighborhoods crime increasing or decreasing	.099**	0.003	0.006	0.005	0.019	0.001	0.013	-			
Sense of belonging to community	.093**	.037**	-.054**	0.004	-0.006	0.012	.026*	.064**	-		
Population's	.121**	0.022	-.124**	0.021	0.02	.037**	.035**	.245**	.035**	-	
	-.031*	-.199**	.119**	-.012	-.032**	-.045**	-.096**	-.022	-.009	-.046*	-

living centre	.073**	.067**	-	.147**	.323**	-	.039**	0.018	0.017	0.013	-.024*	-			
Employment main activity during the past 12 months			.071**			0.015									
Concern for with personal safety from crime	.127**	.039**	-.069**	-.088**	-.033**	-.025*	0.002	.134**	.108**	.133*	-.046**	-0.01	-		
Protective actions taken out of fear of crime	.097**	.047**	-.117**	-.0022	0.004	.043**	-0.012	.054**	.096**	.037*	-0.012	.028*	.131**	-	
Trust in strangers	.048**	.130**	-.037**	-.092**	-.090**	.032**	.077**	.086**	.028*	.071*	-.060**	-0.003	.105**	.032*	-

	.188**	.053**	-	0.0	0.006	.042**	0.015	.195**	.205**	.171*	-	.054**	.255**	.131*	.052**	-
Disruptive Neighbour's Behavioural pattern Index			.146**	.05						*	.036**		**	*	**	

Source: General Social Survey, 2014, public use micro data file, Statistics Canada, calculations by author

*p≤.05, **p≤.01

Appendix 2: Items included in Index of Global Discrimination and Disruptive Neighbours'

Behavioural Pattern Index

Table A.2 Items in Global Discrimination Index (Alpha=0.858)
DIS_15: In the past five years, have you experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly by others in Canada because of your ethnicity or culture?
DIS_20: In the past five years, have you experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly by others in Canada because of your race or colour?
DTS_20: In what types of situations have you experienced discrimination in the past 5 years? Was it in a store, bank or restaurant?
DTS_25: In what types of situations have you experienced discrimination in the past 5 years? Was it at work or when applying for a job or promotion?
DIS_50: In the past five years, have you experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly by others in Canada because of your language?
DISCRIM: Respondent has been a victim of discrimination in the past five years.

Table A.3 Items included in Disruptive Neighbours' Behavioural Pattern Index (Alpha=0.83)
SDQ_110: In your neighbourhood, how much of a problem are noisy neighbours or loud parties?
SDQ_120: In your neighbourhood, how much of a problem are people hanging around on the streets?
SDQ_140: In your neighbourhood, how much of a problem is garbage or litter lying around?
SDQ_150: In your neighbourhood, how much of a problem is vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles?
SDQ_160: In your neighbourhood, how much of a problem are people being attacked or harassed because of their skin colour, ethnic origin or religion?
SDQ_170: In your neighbourhood, how much of a problem are people using or dealing drug?
SDQ_180: In your neighbourhood, how much of a problem are people being drunk or rowdy in public places?

Appendix 3 Questionnaire Used in GSS 2014⁹ to Collect Data¹⁰

AGEGR10: What is your age?

- 2 25 to 34
- 3 35 to 44
- 4 45 to 54
- 5 55 to 64
- 6 65 to 74
- 7 75 years and older
- 96 Valid skip
- 97 Don't know
- 98 Refusal
- 99 Not stated

SEX: Sex of respondent

- 1 Male
- 2 Female
- 6 Valid skip
- 7 Don't know
- 8 Refusal
- 9 Not stated

LUC_RST: Population centres indicator

- 1 Larger urban population centres (CMA/CA)
- 2 Rural areas/small population centres (non-CMA/CA)
- 3 Prince Edward Island
- 6 Valid skip
- 7 Don't know
- 8 Refusal
- 9 Not stated

LWC_10: In general, would you say that you live in a welcoming community?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 6 Valid skip
- 7 Don't know
- 8 Refusal
- 9 Not stated

⁹ Source: Statistics Canada. (2017). General Social Survey, Cycle 28, 2014: Victimization, Main File (Study Documentation).

¹⁰ Questions related to the variables used in this study are mentioned

SBL_100: How would you describe your sense of belonging to your local community? Is it...?

- 1 Very strong
- 2 Somewhat strong
- 3 Somewhat weak
- 4 Very weak
- 5 No opinion
- 6 Valid skip
- 7 Don't know
- 8 Refusal
- 9 Not stated

TIP_25: Using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 means 'Cannot be trusted at all' and 5 means 'Can be trusted a lot', how much do you trust each of the following groups of people: strangers?

- 1 1 - Cannot be trusted at all
- 2 2
- 3 3
- 4 4
- 5 5 - Can be trusted a lot
- 6 Valid skip
- 7 Don't know
- 8 Refusal
- 9 Not stated

NSC_20: During the last 5 years, do you think that crime in your neighbourhood has increased, decreased or remained about the same?

- 1 Increased
- 2 Decreased
- 3 About the same
- 4 Just moved/has not lived in neighbourhood long enough
- 6 Valid skip
- 7 Don't know
- 8 Refusal
- 9 Not stated

SPS_10: In general, how satisfied are you with your personal safety from crime?

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Satisfied
- 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- 4 Dissatisfied
- 5 Very dissatisfied
- 6 No opinion

- 96 Valid skip
- 97 Don't know
- 98 Refusal
- 99 Not stated

PFC_185: Did you do this/Have you done any of these things to protect yourself or your property from crime in the last 12 months?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 6 Valid skip
- 7 Don't know
- 8 Refusal
- 9 Not stated

MAR_110: During the past 12 months, was your main activity working at a paid job or business, looking for paid work, going to school, caring for children, household work, retired or something else?

- 1 Working at a paid job or business
- 2 Looking for paid work
- 3 Going to school
- 4 Caring for children
- 5 Household work
- 6 Retired
- 7 Maternity/paternity or parental leave
- 8 Long term illness
- 9 Volunteering or care-giving other than for children
- 10 Other – Specify
- 96 Valid skip
- 97 Don't know
- 98 Refusal
- 99 Not stated

EHG3_01: What is the highest certificate, diploma or degree that you have completed?

- 1 Less than high school diploma or its equivalent
- 2 High school diploma/high school equivalency certificate
- 3 Trade certificate or diploma
- 4 College, CEGEP/other non-university certificate or diploma
- 5 University certificate or diploma below the bachelor's level
- 6 Bachelor's degree (e.g. B.A., B.Sc., LL.B.)
- 7 University certificate, diploma/degree above bachelor's
- 96 Valid skip
- 97 Don't know
- 98 Refusal

99 Not stated

BRTHCAN: In what country were you born?

- 1 Born in Canada
- 2 Born outside Canada
- 6 Valid skip
- 7 Don't know
- 8 Refusal
- 9 Not stated

YRARRI: In what year did you first come to Canada to live?

- 1 Prior to 1946
- 2 1946 to 1959
- 3 1960 to 1964
- 4 1965 to 1969
- 5 1970 to 1974
- 6 1975 to 1979
- 7 1980 to 1984
- 8 1985 to 1989
- 9 1990 to 1994
- 10 1995 to 1999
- 11 2000 to 2004
- 12 2005 to 2009
- 13 2010 to 2014
- 96 Valid skip
- 97 Don't know
- 98 Refusal
- 99 Not stated

VISMIN: Visible minority status of the respondent

- 1 Visible minority
- 2 Not a visible minority
- 6 Valid skip
- 7 Don't know
- 8 Refusal
- 9 Not stated

VISMIN: You may belong to one or more racial or cultural groups on the following list. Are you... ?

- 1. White
- 2. South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan)
- 3. Chinese

4. Black
5. Filipino
6. Latin American
7. Arab
8. Southeast Asian (e.g., Vietnamese, Cambodian,
9. Malaysian, Laotian)
10. West Asian (e.g., Iranian, Afghan)
11. Korean
12. Japanese
13. Other – Specify (Go to PG_S01)
14. DK, RF

LANHSD: Respondent's household language

- 1 English Only
- 2 French Only
- 3 Other language only
- 4 English and French equally
- 5 English and Other equally
- 6 French and Other equally
- 7 English, French and Other equally
- 96 Valid skip
- 97 Don't know
- 98 Refusal
- 99 Not stated