NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ETHNICIY AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS IN CANADA, 1981

by

Marziya Yasmin

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF Doctor of Philosophy

Sociology

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING 1989

ISBN 0-315-52962-8

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR Marziya Yasmin

TITLE OF THESIS ETHNICIY AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS IN CANADA, 1981

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED Doctor of Philosophy

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1989

(SIGNED) M. Yasmin

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

301 DHANMANDI RD #25

DHAKA

BANGLADESH

DATED April 26, 1989

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled ETHNICITY AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS IN CANADA, 1981 submitted by Marziya Yasmin in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

.....

Dr. Baha Abu-Laban

.....

Dr. A. K. Davis

.....

Dr. F. Trovato

.....

Dr. D. Bai

.....

Dr. A. S. A. Mohsen

.....

Dr. P. D. Chimbos

Date.....

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study, was to examine the correlates of socioeconomic status by incorporating a set of ethnic demographic and ecological variables.

The analyses were attempted both at the individual and at the aggregate level. At the individual level, samples representing the national population, the members of the foreign-born group, members of six ethnic groups and that of the thirteen largest Census Metropolitan Areas were examined. The results at the individual level,indicated that demographic variables such as sex and age were more influential on socioeconomic status than ethnic variables. Among ethnic variables, use of English as a home language had the strongest influence on socioeconomic status.

The aggregate analyses indicated that both demographic and ethnic variables were influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the Chairman of my Supervisory Committee, Dr. Baha Abu-Laban, for his helpful guidance, incredible patience and encouragement throughout the preparation of this thesis. I am equally indebted to my Co-Supervisor, Dr. A. K. Davis, for his invaluable feedback, persistent support and encouragement which made the successful completion of this thesis possible. Special appreciation is given to Dr. F. Trovato, for his insightful advice at various stages of this study.

The constructive comments that I received from Drs. D. Bai, A. Mohsen, and P. Chimbos are also acknowledged. Thanks are also due to Chuck Humphrey and Terry Terraim for their technical assistance with the data analysis.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my friends Jayachandran John, Vijaya Krishnan, Lal Samarasekerra and Manoshi Das for their helpful suggestions and moral support. Thanks are also extended to Myrna Thomas for her dexterity and promptness in typing some of the tables of this thesis.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Research Problem

One of the dominant themes in Canadian sociology is the relationship between ethnicity and social class. The purpose of this study is to investigate this relationship and account for the factors which may explain differentials in social inequality among ethnic groups. Data for the study is derived from the 1981 Canadian Census. A total of fifteen variables are examined.

Social inequality is a persisting and pervasive feature of all societies, past and present. The sociological importance of social inequality has been widely recognised among scholars and social thinkers. Generally speaking, the concept of social inequality refers to the unequal or uneven distribution of scarce and desired goods. From a sociological perspective, we are confronted with the questions of 'who gets what?' 'Why and how some groups get more than others?'.

Manifestations of such inequality may be apparent along three major dimensions: class, status and party, to use Weber's terminology. Within each dimension, a number of indicators are used. In combination, these indicators include such things as social and political power, occupational status, education, wealth or income. In this study, the emphasis is on inequality among ethnic groups in terms of social class.

The study of ethnic inequality is important for at least two reasons. First it will assist in understanding the type of race relations and associated opportunity structure which exist in a given society. Second, it may provide new insights into state ethnic policies. For example, Canada has adopted a policy of multiculturalism whereby all ethnic cultures are presumed to be "equal". Under this policy, all ethnic groups may be assisted in retaining their cultural heritage (if they desire to do so). But this policy has been found to be effective only to the extent it allows the symbolic display of the ethnic cultures. Beyond this, the policy of multiculturalism has been a myth, particularly in terms of equalizing social and economic

opportunities for all ethnic groups. It is expected that the present study will shed some light on this particular problem.

Porter's (1965) work on the 'Vertical Mosaic' has been a pioneering contribution in this domain. In his study of ethnic affiliation and social class, Porter found that some ethnic groups were relatively more advantaged than others. Porter's thesis was supported by a number of researchers such as Richmond (1967a and 1973), Breton and Roseborough (1971), Blishen (1970), Li (1978), Darroch (1980) and Weinfeld (1988). These studies reaffirm the existence of ethnic inequality in Canada. The present study reassesses Porter's thesis of ethnic inequality by examining the most recent census data for Canada.

Most of the earlier studies on ethnic inequality reflect some limitations in terms of scope and methodology. A major methodological limitation of some of the earlier studies involves the measurement of ethnicity (this issue is discussed in detail in Chapter Two). Moreover, most of the earlier research is confined to relatively small samples, and is therefore of questionable reliability. The present study attempts to overcome these shortcomings by employing a methodologically more sound measure of ethnicity, as well as focusing on a relatively larger sample. Furthermore, a broader perspective is taken in this study by introducing demographic and ecological variables that are extraneous to ethnicity.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

This research attempts to investigate the web of relationships between ethnicity and social class. The literature shows that there has been controversy regarding the conceptualization of social class. It is therefore important to examine some of the theories surrounding the concept of social class and clarify its premises for the present study.

Much interest in this domain has been generated by Marx's theory of social class. According to Marx, society is dichotomized into two categories of people, which are differentiated on the basis of their relationship to the means of production and distribution. Application of such dichotomy based on property ownership, is of dubious value in the

Canadian context. With the changing economy, Canada has undergone considerable changes in terms of its labour force structure as well as ownership and control of property (Porter 1965:20-21).

In view of this changing system, the concept of social class is also likely to acquire a new meaning. Taking into account this changing system, new theories have emerged. In this context Giddens' theory of social class draws our attention. Following Marx, Giddens observes that means of production is a dominant factor in generating a class system (Giddens 1973:271,272). But Giddens also acknowledges the existence of a new category of people in the class system which is distinguishable by its educational qualifications and skills. He proposes a three dimensional framework for social class analysis, which includes property, power and education. These three dimensions, Giddens maintains, will generate classes only to the extent that they operate independently. But there are likely to be some deviations from the three-dimensional pattern, when these categories overlap with one another or when some external factors mediate the system. Because of such intricacies, the boundaries between classes are often not easily discernible. Giddens' three-dimensional approach to social class serves as a means of bridging the Marxist perspective with the more modern perspective. On the one hand, Giddens takes into account the means of production as a criterion of social class, which indicates a Marxist thrust. On the other hand, Giddens maintains that the social classes are not discrete categories and that some anomalies are likely to blur class boundaries. He further maintains a three-dimensional concept of social class which closely corresponds to the three-dimensional concept of socioeconomic status perceived by more contemporary sociologists.

Some of the contemporary scholars conceptualize social class in terms of differences in income, education, occupation and prestige. According to Blau and Duncan (1968: 6), occupation constitutes an important component of the social stratification system in modern industrial society. It is an indication of one's social status in the society and to some extent, it serves as a yardstick for assessing one's level of education as well as earning capacity. Therefore, occupation, education and income, in combination are regarded as a measure of

one's socioeconomic status. This measure in turn, is regarded as a valid representation of social class.

In the present research, social class is represented by the above noted measures of socioeocnomic status. A major limitation of this approaches is that it tends to overlook the element of social interaction among social classes, which reduces its sociological import. Nonetheless, these socioeocnomic categories which are multi-dimensional in nature, appear to be a useful measure of social class.

The emphasis in this study is on the relatiobship between social class and ethnicity. It is presumed that differences in social class are explained by a number of factors of which ethnicity is a critical one. Theories of ethnic stratification maintain that one's position in the social class system is determined by the ethnic group to which he is born. A hierarchy of ethnic goups is envisaged in these theories, which is congruent with the hierarchy of social class. For a better understanding of the relationship between ehtnicity and social class, it is crucial to examine some of the theories pertaining to the subordinate status of ethnic groups.

A pioneering theory in the domain of ethnic stratification is that of Noel's (1968). He is of the opinion that ethnocentrism, competition and differential power are the three criteria for the emergence of a dominant/subordinate relationships among ethnic groups.

In a more comprehensive fashion, Kwan and Shibutani (1965) discussed the process of ethnic stratification. They concluded that four different processes were involved in ethnic stratification: differentiation, sustenance, disjunction and integration. This analysis provided by Kwan and Shibutani delineates some of the major intricacies involved in the process of ethnic stratification.

Van den Berghe's (1978) theory of racial stratification has also attracted much attention among scholars. He develops a typology of race relations whereby two systems are identified, namely the paternalistic system and the competitive system. The paternalistic system is more prevalent in pre-industrial societies. This system follows a master-servant model where roles and statuses are sharply defined along racial lines and are ascriptive in nature. Therefore social mobility of racial groups in such societies is restricted.

In contrast to this, the competitive type of race relations is more prevalent in industrialized societies. The dominant/subordinate relationship is not as rigid as in the paternalistic system. Racial membership remains ascribed, though class differences are not as wide. There is more emphasis on achievement which provides an opportunity for social mobility among the subordinate racial groups. The system also provides a potential for the development of self-contained institutions for racial minorities, paralleling the institutions of the dominant racial group. This eventually translates into a cleavage between the dominant and subordinate racial groups.

This typology of race relations serves as a useful framework for analysing ethnic and racial stratification from a macrosociological perspective. Van den Berghe's illustration of the competitive system in particular, appears to be useful for understanding of ethnic stratification in the Canadian context. The tension between ascription and achievement, to which van den Berghe refers, provides a strong foundation for furthering ethnic stratification theories in contemporary Canada.

One of the most widely recognised theories of social class in Canada was developed by Porter (1965). Porter asserts that one's position in the social class system is determined by the ethnic group in which he is born. A further methodological development of Porter's approach is observed in the status attainment model of Blau and Duncan (1967). This model posits that occupational status is a function of prior achieved status and social origin variables such as one's previous occupation, level of education, parents' education and occupation.

The present study intends to investigate ethnic inequality from this bi-polar dimension of ascription and achievement. As a further extension of this model, a set of demographic and ecological factors are included for explaining the impact of ethnicity on social class. It is expected that the inclusion of these structural variables, which are extraneous to ethnicity, will widen our outlook regarding ethnic inequality.

1.3 Organisation of the Study

The chapter following examines the relevant literature on ethnic stratification. The main objectives of the study are also elaborated in this chapter. Chapter Three discusses the methodological procedures followed in the study, while Chapter Four provides detailed information on the sample. The findings are presented in Chapters Five to Seven. In Chapter Five differentials in socioeconomic status are examined for a sample representing the national population as well as sub-samples representing the members of the foreign-born on the one hand, and the members of various ethnic origins on the other. Chapter Six also examines differentials in socioeconomic status but the analysis is based on Census Metropolitan Areas. In Chapter Seven, the analysis is further extended by examining differentials in socioeconomic status at an aggregate level. Finally, the conclusions are presented in Chapter Eight.

2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature in this chapter will be confined to studies which represent one or the other of the distinct approaches to the measurement and or analysis of ethnic affiliation. The results of this review will influence the methodological procedure to be followed in the present study. For the purpose of this study, four main approaches are identified: the ascriptive approach; the achievement approach; the demographic approach; and the ecological approach. Studies which are discussed under each category may have elements related to the other approaches. Thus, regardless of where a given study is classified, it should be emphasized that such a study is not necessarily unmindful or unaware of the other approaches. It is largely a question of emphasis, which has been the guiding principle in making decisions about classification. Each of the four approaches will now be discussed in turn.

2.1 Ascriptive Approach

Porter (1965) was the main proponent of the ascriptive approach. As mentioned earlier in the introduction of this thesis, Porter's thesis is that ethnic origin, as an ascriptive factor, has an influence on social class. As has been indicated, researchers supporting this thesis are Richmond (1967a 1973), Blishen (1970), Breton and Roseborough (1971), Forcese (1973), Li (1978), Richmond and Kalbach (1980), Darroch (1980), Lautard and Loree (1980), Pineo and Porter (1985). The extensive amount of research following this approach, is illustrative of much controversy regarding the conceptualization of ethnic affiliation and its methodological usage. Much of the research following this approach is bifurcated between the use of single indicators of ethnicity on the one hand, and that of multiple indicators of ethnicity on the other.

2.1.1 Single Indicators

Many differences prevail among those researchers who employed single indicators for measuring ethnic affiliation. Porter (1965), for example, used 'ethnic origin' as an indicator

of ethnic affiliation. In the Canadian census, the question used for measuring ethnic origin is: "To what ethnic group do you or your ancestors belong?" This question can only trace back one's paternal ancestry (Blishen 1970:113). Aside from paternal lineage, the option between 'you or your ancestors' can give misleading answers where ethnic affiliation might refer to a respondent's ancestors without referring to his/her current ethnic affiliation or vice versa. Above all, the question simply allows us to trace back one's ancestral roots without referring to subjective or voluntary affiliation with an ethnic group.

In contrast, Blishen (1970:10) used country of birth as a measure of ethnicity. Others like Richmond (1967a, 1973) used national origin. Both country of birth and national origin are effective indicators, to the extent the respondent is a first generation immigrant. For the Canadian born, however, country of birth and national origin lose their significance. For example, Pineo and Porter (1985:359) observe that for native-born Canadians ethnicity is less likely to be a significant component of their identity. With subsequent generations, ethnic groups are likely to lose some of their ethnic attributes and assimilate into the mainstream society, even though some aspects of their ethnic identity are still retained.

A more meaningful indicator for examining the effects of ethnicity on occupational status would be to separate foreign-born and native-born groups. The members of the native-born groups, because of their birth and social upbringing in a Canadian environment, are expected to have a different set of value orientations than the members of the foreign-born group. Such visible social differences between the two groups are likely to have a differential impact on socioeconomic status.

In this context, Boyd (1985:405) observes that native-born males who received their education in Canada are at a relatively advantageous position in the labour market since their education is more readily accepted by their employers. Compared to this, the foreign-born members not only face the barrier of translating their education from their original home country to the Canadian labour market, but they also face the challenge of gaining fluency in the language of the host society.

From a theoretical standpoint, the indigeneous population is likely to have more political power and discriminate against migrants (Rex 1970). While this theory may hold true for some groups at a certain point in time, it may not be the case for others. For example, changes in immigration policy to recruit highly professional and skilled labourers may suggest that, on the average, members of the foreign-born group may occupy a relatively higher socioeconomic status than members of the native-born group.

Empirical research along this line is not entirely consistent. For example Nam (1959) in a study of ten nationality groups in the U.S.A., found that the native-born groups occupy a relatively higher socioeconomic status than their foreign-born counterparts, when age and social origin are controlled for. Similarly, Duncan and Duncan (1968;362) found that the native-born ethnic groups are found in relatively higher occupational status than the immigrant groups.

In the Canadian context, Kalbach (1970:220) suggests that on the whole, the native-born groups occupy higher status jobs compared to the foreign-born groups. Contrary to this, Blishen (1970) in a study of the native-born Canadians with eleven foreign-born groups found the foreign-born groups to be in a relatively better occupational status than the native-born groups. Others like Boyd (1985:423), found that the native-born groups occupy a middle range position between high status and low status immigrant groups. Clearly, the occupational inequality between the native-born and foreign-born groups is not uniform across the spectrum. Further research needs to be done before any definite conclusions can be drawn.

Other than nativity, ethnic language is another component of ethnicity that is likely to influence socioeconomic status. But language is also likely to have little significance among native-born Canadians. [1] For the immigrant group however, use of one's ethnic language, or a deficiency in the use of the language of the host society can be a major impediment towards high status occupations in the labour market. For example, Porter (1965:69) notes that many immigrants went into low status occupations because of their deficiency in use of English and

[1] Darroch and Marston (1972:17) found that English is the mother tongue of a significant number of ethnic groups who are of non British origin.

French which are the languages of of the charter groups (currently recognised as the offcial laanguages of Canada). Thus, ethnic groups whose home language is other than English or French are often less fluent in these official languages. Therefore, they are likely to be at a relatively disadvantageous position in the labour market compared to those who are more fluent in the language of the host society. This means that occupational inequality may also be attributed to the use of ethnic language or, conversely, the extent of fluency in the language of the host country. The works of Tepperman (1975), Reitz (1977), Boulet and Veltman (1981), Boyd (1981), and McRoberts(1985) are examples where language was used as a correlate of occupational inequality. Specifically, these studies indicate that the Anglophones more often are better placed occupationaly than the Francophones.

It appears that each of these indicators, i.e. ethnic origin, place of birth, and language, despite some limitations, are nevertheless important in explaining discrepancies in the socioeconomic status.

2.1.2 Multiple Indicators

Some researchers attempted to examine the effect of ethnicity on social class, by employing multiple indicators of ethnicity.

Goldlust and Richmond (1974), in their study of immigrants' adaptation process, employed multiple predictors such as birth place, mother tongue and religion, and found them to be relatively less influential in explaining variation in social mobility, compared to education, length of residence and age on arrival. The use of multiple indicators in this study is a significant methodological contribution to the literature of ethnic stratification. But the extent to which their findings hold true, remains to be seen.

Contrary to Goldlust and Richmond's findings, Ornstein (1981) found that place of birth and mother tongue to be influential factors in explaining variation in socioeconomic status among ethnic groups. But again, Ornstein's research is confined to the province of Ontario only which limits the generality of his findings.

A national study of the impact of selected social origin variables on occupational status was carried out by Boyd (1981). A number of sub-samples representing ethnic origin, nativity, linguistic origin, and sex were used in this study. Boyd concludes that occupational disparity exists within each of the sub-samples and contends that this disparity is largely accounted for by by social origin variables. Boyd's research, while addressing the issue of occupational inequality for each of the sub-samples, does not take into account the differential effects of ethnic variables.

Literature reviewed so far, indicates that two main perspectives have been followed by researchers in studying ehtnic inequality. One group of researchers treated ethnicity as a correlate of occupational or socioeconomic status. The works of Porter (1965), Blishen (1970), Boulet and Veltmen (1978), Li (1978), Darroch (1980), Forcese (1980), Ornstein (1981), Lautard and Loree (1984), Pineo and Porter (1985) are some of the examples who followed this perspective. Another group of researchers treated ethnic groups as sub-samples and examined inter-ethnic occupational differences. Some examples in this context are the works of Breton and Roseborough (1971), Cuneo and Curtis (1975), Boyd (1981), Boyd (1985).

In the present study, both strategies will be used. Firstly, ethnic variables will examined as correlates of socioeconomic status. Secondly, ethnic groups will be treated as sub-samples whereby, differentials in socioeconomic status of each of these sub-samples will be examined. Therefore each of the approaches examined in literature review will be considered from this dual perspective.

We also observed some ambiguity regarding conceptualiztion of ethnicity among rsearchers who employed single indictors of ethnicity. In order to overcome this ambiguity, we shall employ multiple indicators of ethnicity, wherein three different indictors i.e ethnic origin, place of birth, and use of home language will be included.

2.2 Achievement Approach

In contrast to the ascriptive syndrome, some researchers posit an achievement syndrome in explaining variation in socioeconomic status among ethnic groups. They argue that differences in socioeconomic status can be explained to a large extent by differences in eductional and occupational aspirations (Rosen 1956, and 1959). However, studies by Breton and Roseborough (1971) do not support this approach. Similar findings are reported by Featherman (1971). Ornstein's research on occupational mobility is yet another example in this context. He examined the effects of ethnic origin, place of birth language and place of education on occupational status. He found that many of the differences in occupational status can be attributed to differences in place of birth, mother tongue and place of education. This indicates that aside from ethnic variables other variables such as place of education are useful in explaining variation in the socioeconomic status of ethnic groups.

Other studies such as those of Li (1978), Goldlust and Richmond (1974), Reitz (1973), Featherman (1971:220) Duncan and Duncan (1968:363) have indicated that level of education is an important factor in explaining differences in socioeconomic status across ethnic groups.

As a further explanation to this viewpoint (influence of education on socioeconomic status), it is maintained that differences in level of education is attributed to differences in equality of opportunity in making education available. For example, Conant (1961), and Sexton (1961) in their study of racial inequality in education have indicated that the American blacks and Puerto Ricans have been deprived from benefits relating to educational opportunities. In the Canadian context ethnic inequlaity in terms of educational opportunities was found between the French and the British ethnic groups (Rocher 1965). Some scholars such as Dofny and Riox (1964) are of the opinion that the French Canadians are not only identifiable as an ethnic group but also as social class. They occupy a relatively lower social class poosition and therefore are less priviliged in terms of access to educational opportunities. Porter (1965) in his analysis of social class and educational opportunities has succinctly pointed out that differences in geographic composition and ethnic composition determines to

some extent the kind of educational facilities which are available.

In addition to level of education, researchers have included other social origin variables. In other words occupational inequality is explained in terms of bi-polar dimensions of ascription and achievement. In this context, Blau and Duncan (1967) postulated a social stratification model, which demonstrates that occupational inequality among ethnic groups, can be attributed to differences in social origin such as education, first occupation, and father's occupation. The works of Duncan and Duncan (1968), Featherman (1971) Cuneo and Curtis (1975) and Li (1978) are examples where Blau and Duncan's model has been employed.

These studies are an improvement over earlier research, in the sense that they employ multivariate analyses as compared to earlier studies most of which employed bivariate analyses. Such studies employing a framework which goes beyond the limits of ascription, have made worhtwhile contributions. However, given the limitations of census data, social origin variables are excluded from the present study.

2.3 The Demographic Approach

A third approach introduced in the literature on ethnic stratification is the demographic approach. This approach entails the incorporation of demographic variables along with ethnic variables for explaining variation in socioeconomic status. The literature reviewed indicates little evidence of such an approach.

Lautard and Loree (1984), in their study of ethnic stratification in Canada, introduced sex along with ethnicity in order to explain variation in socioeconomic status. Employing the index of dissimilarity, they concluded that ethnic differentiation within the female component of the labour force is less than that of the male component. Inasmuch as their findings are regarded as a valuable contribution to the literature on ethnic stratification, the methodological procedures for their study are subject to question. The index of dissimilarity has its shortcomings, in the sense that it allows comparison of only two groups at

a time and does not make allowance for an overall assessment of more than two groups.

Goldlust and Richmond's (1974) study of adaptation of immigrants in Canada included demographic variables such as length of residence, nativity, and selected social origin variables such as father's occupation and education. They found that occupational differences between the foreign-born and native-born could be largely explained by the combined effects of father's occupation, education, present occupation, age and length of residence in Toronto.

Other researchers have introduced age as a demographic variable along with ethnic variables for examining occupational mobility. The work of McRoberts et al (1976) is an example in this context.

Boyd (1985) in a study of occupational attainment of native and foreign-born groups,included age at immigration as a control variable and found that those immigrants who migrated to Canada prior to age 17 have higher educational and occupational attainment than those immigrants who migrated at age 17 or later. More recently, Li (1988) examined the net effect of ethnic origin on schooling and income by controlling the effects of sex, age, natvity and social class. He found that the net effects of ethnic origin on income and education get attenuated when these control variables are introduced.

While these studies may be useful in facilitating our understanding of discrepency in socioeconomic status from a broader perspective that is extraneous to ethnicity, they provide very little support for arriving at any level of generalization. To date, the studies utilizing this (demographic) approach have been sporadic and more in isolation employing mostly single demographic factors within a framework of ethnic or social origin variables. The thrust in the literature has been more towards an ascriptive or achievement approach rather than demographic. Very little attempt has been made towards studies which systematically incorporate a set of demographic and ethnic variables within a common framework. An attempt will therefore be made in the present study to incoporate both ethnic and demographic variables within a common framework. The set of demographic variables that are included in the present study are age, age at arrival, length of residence, sex, family size and mobility.

a. Age :

Some of the studies on occupational mobility have included age-cohorts as a variable in explaining differences in occupational mobility. For example, as mentioned earlier Nam (1974) in a study of ten nationality groups in the U.S.A., found that native-born groups have a relatively higher socioeconomic status than the foreign-born groups, when age and social origin are controlled. This means that there are likely to be variations in socioeconomic status in terms of age-cohorts. McRoberts et al (1976) found that differences in occupation decrease as one moves from the older to younger age cohorts.

From a theoretical viewpoint, age is expected to be of much relevance in explaining discrepancies in socioeocnomic status. For example, Anderson and Frideres (1980) speculate that ethnicity is likely to diminish with age. Based on this speculation, it is assumed that age will have an influence on socioeconomic status, with the younger age group having a relatvely higher socioeconomic status than the older age group.

b. Age at Arrival:

Age cohorts by themselves however, are not very meaningful in explaining variation in socioeconomic status of members of foreign-born ethnic groups, unless their age at arrival and length of residence in the receiving society are taken into account.

The literature on adaptation of immigrant groups in the receiving society indicates that immigrants who arrive at a younger age are likely to adapt to the receiving society faster than those who arrive at a relatively older age. For example, Goldlust and Richmond (1974:205) in their study of immigrant adaptation found that among immigrants, low age on arrival was associated with high education and more rapid acculturation (acculturation in this context refers to some level of cultural conformity to the host society on the part of the immigrant group). This implies that in the long run, those members who arrived in Canada at a relatively young age are likely to be at a more advantageous position in terms of attaining high socioeconomic status than those who arrived at a relatively older age.

Boyd (1985), as mentioned earlier, in her study of immigration and occupational attainment found that immigrants who arrived prior to age 17 had higher educational and occupational attainments than those who migrated after age 17. Her rationale for this age break was to distinguish the status of immigrants prior to migrating in Canada. Chances are that immigrants who migrated prior to age 17 entered Canada as part of a family and completed their schooling in Canada which is more readily acceptable in the Canadian labour market and in the long run, an advantage in terms of attaining high socioeconomic status. This however is not the case for members who arrived in Canada after age 17. It is quite likely that these members had their education outside Canada. Consequently, with their foreign education, they are likely to encounter some barrier in translating their educational experiences in the Canadian labour market. Apparently they are more likely to be placed at a relatively disadvantageous position in the Canadian labour market.

Trovato and Grindstaff (1986:570) in their study of the economic status of native-born and foreign-born women at age thirty, hypothesized that women who migrated to Canada during their adolescence or later years of life are likely to have relatively lower socioeconomic status than those who migrated to Canada during their childhood. They maintain that the implication of this hypothesis is that the longer the immigrants reside in the host society, the higher the level of adjustment and acculturation to the new society. From their study they concluded that among the foreign-born women (both single and ever married) those who came to Canada during their childhood are at a relatively more advantaged position in the economic structure than those who arrived in Canada at a relatively older age. From this research it appears that among members of the foreign-born group those who arrive in Canada at a relatively younger age are more likely to have higher socioeconomic status than those who arrive at a relatively older age. Thus, age at immigration appears to be an important variable in explaining variation in socioeocnomic status. The present research therefore intends to include this variable for explaining variation in socioeconomic status.

c.Length of Residence:

For the foreign-born members, their length of residence in Canada is also expected to explain variation in socioeconomic status. With longer length of residence in a new environment, the foreign-born ethnic groups are expected to adapt better. For instance, Lieberson (1963) notes that variation in assimilation among the foreign-born groups is apparently related to recency of arrival. As mentioned earlier, Goldlust and Richmond (1974) in their study of adaptation of immgrants found length of residence as one of the variables influencing social mobility. It is expected that with long lengt residence in the receiving country, the immigrants adapt better and apparently are more likely to improve their socioeconomic status. Thus, length of residence is expected to have a positive infleunce on the socioeconomic status of immigrant groups. To what extent this is true in the Canadian context remains unanswered. From this standpoint, this variable, i.e length of residence has bee included in the present study.

d.Sex:

Another demographic variable that is expected to influence the socieconomic status of ethnic groups is sex. Even though much research has attempted to examine sexual inequality, there is very little evidence of research explaining the role of sex in explaining variation in socioeconomic status of ethnic groups. Research on sexual inequality in the Canadian context indicates that the male members of the society are in a relatively higher socioeconomic status than their female counterparts (Abella 1986, Boyd 1986, Fox and Fox 1986, Denton and Hunter 1982, Goyder 1981).

Boyd et al (1981) (as referred earlier), in a study of status attainment model, examined differences in status attainment across a number of sub-groups including sex, ethnic origin, nativity, and linguistic groups. They found that the influence of social origin variables is much stronger for men than for women. This is still apparent when gender is broken down by nativity. It therefore appears that male members representing the larger society as well as those from sub-cultural groups are at a relatively higher socioeconomic status than their

female counterparts. Further research is required for a verification of the findings. The present research therefore attempts to include sex as a variable in order to ascertain the role of sex in explaining variation in socioeconomic status, controlling for a number of other ethnic and demographic variables. Given the existing disparity in socioeconomic status in terms of sex, it is expected that male ethnic groups are likely to have relatively higher socioeconomic status than their female counterparts.

e. Family Size:

Another demographic factor that is likely to affect the socioeconomic status of ethnic groups is that of family size. Earlier research indicates that there is an inverse relationship between family size and socioeconomic status (Kenneth 1970). Trovato (1986:580) on examining the socioeconomic status attainment of native-born and foreign-born women found that among both groups, the larger the family size, the lower the proportion of women with education, occupation and income achievement. It has also been found that, educational opportunities become limited with an increase in family size (Cuneo and Curtis 1975:18). With such limitations in educational opportunities, the chances of attaining high socioeconomic status is also attenuated. It is therefore expected that other things being equal, members representing small-size families are likely to have relatively higher socioeconomic status than those with large families.

f.Mobility Status:

It is also expected that geographic mobility is likely to have an influence on ethnic occupational differences. Research on geographic mobility indicates that professional men have a higher mobility rate than unskilled and semi-skilled workers (Gallaway 1967a, 1967b), Blau and Duncan (1967), Petersen (1972), Sharma (1980), Sandefur and Wilbur (1981:358) note that individuals in relatively high status occupations are more mobile than those in relatively low status occupations. The expectations of reward associated with such high status occupations is a source of influence for such mobility. Therefore, it is expected that ethnic

groups who are geographically mobile are likely to have higher socioeconomic status than those who are not mobile.

2.4 The Ecological Approach

Another relevant area of research that warrants attention is based on the ecological approach. Most ecological studies treat urban communities as areal units and focus on aggregate or group level of analysis. Studies at the individual level often do not provide enough information to derive generalization at macro level. Studies at the aggregate level, more specifically when urban centres are treated as areal units, are of much relevance for more explicit understanding of the structural differences that may be operating independent of the individual level analysis. Blau (1960:179) contends that structural effects show that social pressures originating outside the individual personality are responsible for the difference in the dependent variable. From this perspective, it becomes crucial to examine such structural effects that operate within a larger framework of a group or community in explaining patterns of variation in the dependent variable.

In this research, an attempt is therefore made to examine variation in scoioeconomic status at the community level, more specifically, at the level of CMAs. Most of the ecological studies attempted earlier, focussed on aggregate data sets because of lack of data sets at the individual level. The present research will concentrate on both individual level data set as well as aggregate level data set, which will allow us to examine the structural effects as well as individual effects independent of each other. In terms of availability of data and feasibility of the present research, three ecological variables are included. They are, proportion of minority groups, proportion of labour force in manufacturing, and size of cities. An elaboration of each of these variables follows below.

a. Proportion of Minority Groups:

Many of the earlier studies on racial or ethnic inequality sought to explain variation in occupation by taking the proportion of minority group present in a community (Blalock 1956, 1957, Brown and Fuguitt 1965, Frisbie and Neidert 1977, Jiobu and Marshall 1971, La Gory and Magnani 1979, Martin and Poston 1972, Wilcox and Roof 1978). In this context, two theoretical stances have been taken to explain the group.

According to the first theoretical perspective, job competition between the subordinate group and the dominant group intensifies with an increase in the size of a minority group. Therefore, hostility between the two groups increases (Blalock 1967).

The second perspective is built around the premise that the labour market is split along racial lines with minorities working in less desirable occupations (Bonacich 1972 1976). This viewpoint is further extended by Frisbie and Neidert 1971 who maintain that a larger proportion of a given minority offers cheap labour for the society at large. Thus, members of a minority group are allocated to the least desirable occupations thereby providing opportunities for members of dominant group to move to relatively higher status occupations.

While the two viewpoints explicate differences regarding the influence of relative size of minority groups on occupational status, both however, conclude that the relative size of minority groups in a community can be expected to have some impact on occupational inequality.

Empirical research along this line demonstrated that occupational disparity between racial groups increases with an increase in the size of minority group. For example, Blalock (1956, 1957), Brown and Fuguitt (1972), Frisbie and Neidert (1977) found that the larger the proportion of minority groups, the greater the income disparity. In a similar vein, Turner (1951), Brown and Fuguitt (1972), Lagory and Magnani (1979), Wilcox and Roof (1978) Frisbie and Neidert 1971), Glenn (1963), Semyonov and Scott (1983) found that occupational disparity between racial groups increased with an increase in the relative size of minority groups. These studies did not take into account ethnic disparity in socioeconomic status per se. Instead, these studies examined ethnic disparity in income or occupation. Ethnic disparity in income or occupation have some relevance for this study because both income and

occupation are regarded as indicators of socioeconomic status.

It is also important to note that research in this domain has been mostly undertaken in the U.S.A. In Canada, research in this domain has been almost negligible. Therefore, an attempt is being made in this study to take into account the influence of proportion of minority groups on socioeconomic status. While earlier studies along this line have demonstrated that occupational disparity tends to be greater with an increase in the relative size of a minority group, it is beyond the scope of the present study to examine this hypothesis specifically. The intent of the present study is to examine the hypothesis that socioeconomic status will vary with the relative size of minority groups.

b. Proportion of Labour Force in Manufacturing Industries:

In addition to the influence of relative size of minority groups on socioeconomic status, it is also expected that other structural components of the community such as the industrial composition, will have an influence on socioeconomic status.

Thompson (1963) notes that manufacturing economies tend to have greater equality between racial groups, because the range of occupations included within this category is relatively narrow compared to some of the other industries. Therefore, a high proportion of labour force in manufacturing industries means a tendency towards more homogeneous occupations and therefore relatively lower level of disparity in socioeconomic status.

Research in this domain has in fact indicated that the occupational disparity between racial groups is inversely related with an increase in the proportion of labour force in manufacturing industries. For example Turner (1951), in an attempt to explain occupational disparity between racial groups, found that proportion of labour force in manufacturing (out of eight different industries that he included in his study) was the most influential variable in explaining occupational disparity and that the two variables were inversely related. Similar findings were reported by Frisbie and Neidert (1977), Lagory and Magnani (1979), and Jiobu and Marshall (1971).

Again most of these studies regarding the influence of industries in explaining occupational disparity, were concentrated in the U.S.A., with little evidence in the Canadian context. Thus, the present study intends to investigate along this line as well, thereby examining the influence of proportion of labour force in manufacturing industries in explaining variation on socioeconomic status. The hypothesis to be examined is that socioeconomic status varies with an increase in the proportion of labour force in manufacturing.

c. Size of Cities:

Another ecological variable that is expected to explain some variation in socioeconomic status is size of urban centres, more specifically city size. According to Hoch (1976) large metropolitan areas are associated with high levels of overall income differentiation. Lagory and Magnani (1979) also maintain that size of metropolitan area is associated with a decrease in occupational disparity in racial groups. Contrary to this, Wirth (1938) and Fischer (1971) contend that levels of tolerance are relatively higher in large metropolitan areas than in smaller areas. Also greater job opportunities in large metropolitan areas would attract more highly qualified labour force (regardless of racial or ethnic background) to these large size cities. This means that occupational disparity between racial or ethnic group is likely to decrease with increasing size of cities.

While such controversies regarding the influence of city size on occupational disparity of ethnic or racial group precludes us from drawing any generalizations, it nevertheless instigates further inquiry along this line.

Empirical research regarding this aspect while suggestive of occupational disparity between racial groups, is not indicative of any definite pattern. For example, Hoch (1976) in a study of effect of population size on wage rate, found that on the whole there was a positive association between population size and wage rate. But this association was found to be stronger for whites than for blacks. But the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analyses (1973) has documented that city size has a stronger positive influence on the economic condition of

blacks than whites. While such findings leave one to speculate about the effect city size has on the pattern of occupational disparity across ethnic or racial groups, it nonetheless lends some credence to the more general assumption that city size has an influence on the occupational distribution of racial or ethnic groups.

This assumption is further supported by Lagory and Magnani (1979) in their study of structural correlates of black and white occupational differentiation in United States. They found that size of urban centres had strong influence on the level of occupational differentiation between racial groups. More specifically, their results indicate that the black racial group is more successful in competing with whites in larger metropolises than in smaller ones.

In a Canadian study, Pineo (1985) indicated that occupational disparity varied across communities and this disparity is much larger than the disparity at the provincial level. Pineo's study did not focus specifically on the effect of community size on occupational disparity. Rather, the focus was on the effects of patterns of migration upon occupational attainment, whereby the effect of community size on occupational discrepancy was examined as a background for understanding the effects of patterns of migration upon occupation. Therefore, the findings while suggestive of occupational disparity across communities, do not provide enough insight for further speculations.

A more significant contribution in this context has been made by Boyd (1985). In a study of differences in occupational attainment between members of foreign-born and native-born groups in Canada, Boyd found that occupational disparity between members of foreign-born and native-born groups, increases with size of urban centres. More specifically, her findings indicate that in large urban centres the members of the foreign-born group have relativley lower occupational status than their native-born counterparts.

In this study, an attempt will be made to examine the influence of city size on the socioeconomic status of ethnic groups. While Boyd's study was confined specifically to the foreign-born and native-born groups, the present study intends to extend the inquiry to ethnic groups as well. The hypothesis to be tested in this context is that disparity in socioeconomic

status of ethnic groups will increase with size of cities.

Thus far, an attempt has been made to review some selective literature relevant for our study. The review indicated four main approaches along which research has been conducted. However, very little attempt has been made to incorporate all four approaches in a broad framework to examine the correlates of socioeconomic status. This is precisely what the present study will attempt to do.

2.5 Main Objectives of the Study

The preceding review of the literature has addressed a number relevant issues that merit further investigation. The present study seeks to reassess the role of ethnicity in explainig variation in socioeconomic status, by including a set of variables extraneous to ethnicity. Each of the four approaches examined in the literature review has provoked further inquiry. For example, research along the ascriptive approach indicated a bifurcation between single and multiple indicators (representing ethnic affiliation).

Therefore, the first objective of this study is to examine the role of ethnicity in explaining variation in socioeconomic status by including multiple indicators i.e ethnic origin, place of birth and home language.

The achievement approach documented that influence of ethnic origin and place of birth on socioeconomic status gets attenuated when level of education is taken into account(Goldlust and Richmond, 1974). While other researchers following the bi-polar perspective of achievement and ascription, maintain that educational opportunities are largely determined by one's ascriptive or ethnic origin. This means that variation in socioeconomic status is not only explained by ethnic origin but also by lack of educational opportunities. In other words, aside from ethnicity, variation in socioeconomic status is explained by level of education, which in turn is attributed to one's ethnic origin. The aim of present research is to extend this inquiry

by examining effect of ethnic origin, nativity as well as use of home language on socioeconomic status through the mediating effects of level of education and conversely to examine the influence of ethnic origin, nativity and use of home language on socioeconomic status, when level of education is introduced as a control variable.

The second objective of this research is then to examine the effects of ethnic origin, place of birth and home language on socioeconomic status through the mediating effects of education and conversely, to examine the effects of ethnic origin, place of birth and home language, when education is held constant.

In the demographic domain available evidence mainfests a number of assumptions that warrant further verification. A number of demographic variables have been introduced in this context, including: age, age at immigration, length of residence, sex, mobility status and family size. Some hypotheses have been formulated regarding the influence of each of these varibles on socioeconomic status. The next set of objectives therefore involve the testing of the following hypotheses:

Socioeconomic status is likely to be negatively associated with age cohorts, with members of older age groups in relatively lower socioeconomic status than members of younger age groups.

Socioeconomic status of the foreign-born or immigrant group is positively related with age at immigration, indicating high socioeconomic status for those members who arrived in Canada at a relatively younger age than those who arrived at a relatively older age.

Socioeconomic status of foreign-born or immigrant groups is positively associated with length of residence. In other words, the socioeconomic status of foreign-born groups is likely to rise with longer length of stay in Canada.

Socioeconomic status is positively associated with sex, meaning that male members are likely to have a relatively higher socioeconomic status than their female counterparts.

Socioeocnomic status is negatively associated with family size, i.e with large family size there is likely to be a decline in socioeconomic status.

Socioeconomic status is positively associated with geographic mobility, meaning that people who are geographically mobile are more likely to have high socioeconomic status than those who are not.

Aside from demographic factors, ecological factors have also been found to be influential in explaining variations in socioeconomic status across ethnic groups. Earlier research has indicated that size of city, the porportion of minority groups, and the proportion of the labour force have an influence on socioeoconomic status. Therefore, the ninth, tenth and eleventh objectives of our study are to examine the following hypotheses.

Socioeconomic status is likely to vary with proportion of labour force in manufacturing.

Socioecoeconomic status is likely to vary with variation in proportion of minority groups.

Socioeconomic status is likely to vary with size of cities.

3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with the methodological issues involved in testing the preceding hypotheses. The chapter is divided into four sections which are as follows:

3.1 Source of Data

The data for this study has been obtained from a secondary source, namely, the 1981 Canadian Census. More specifically, the Public Use Sample Tape representing 2% of the original sample at the individual level has been used. Use of data from a secondary source like the census not only is advantageous in terms of time and money, but also provides information on a large scale, whereby it is possible to include a greater range of variables and employ some statistical techniques for more sophisticated analysis. The data have been analyzed both at the individual and aggregate levels. Each unit of analysis is discussed in detail below.

3.2 Individuals As Units of Analyses

At the inidividual level, the analysis deals with a national sample, sub-samples of foreign-born ethnic group, and sub-samples of six ethnic groups as well as samples representing the thirteen largest Census Metropolitan Areas of Canada. These Census Metropolitan areas are as follows: Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa-Hull, Toronto,

Hamilton, St.Catherines-Niagara, Kitchener, London, Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver. For the rest of this study, Census Metropolitan Areas will be referred to as CMAs.

3.2.1 Operationalization of Variables

A total of 15 variables have been included in our study, all of which are listed below

a. Age
b. Ethnic Origin
c. Home Language
d. Place of Birth
e. Highest Level of Schooling
f. Occupation
g. Total Income
h. Age at Immigration
i. Period of immigration
j. Sex
k. Mobility Status
l. Census Family Size
m. Socioeconomic Status
n. Proportion of Minority Groups
o. Percentage Employed in Manufacturing Industries

The definition and measurement of each of these variables is delineated in the next section. It should be noted that the definition of each of these variables is derived from the Dictionary of the 1981 Census.

a. Age

Age is derived from date of birth. This study is restricted to the age group 15-65 which is the working age population.

b.Ethnic Origin :

Ethnic origin refers to the ethnic group to which the respondent or the respondent's ancestors belonged on first coming to Canada. The 1981 census listed twenty two ethnic categories. These categories are provided in Appendix A. Some of these categories were numerically too small for statistical analyses. So these categories have been collapsed into six which are as follows: British, French, North-West Europeans, South-East Europeans, Non-Eurpeans, and those groups with multiple ethnic identity. The British and the French as the two charter groups need to be differentiated from all other groups. Hence in this study they are identified as two distinct categories. The North-West Europeans and the South-East Europeans have been differentiated on the basis of their broad geographic origins.

The North-West Europeans include the Dutch, Germans, Scandinavians and the Jews. (Even though the geographic origin of the Jews overlaps North-West Europe and South-East Europe, they have been included with the North-West Europeans). Earlier research indicated that this group was well represented in high occupations along with the Dutch and Scandinavians (Porter 1965). The inclusion of Jews with members of the South-East European ethnic group is likely to over-represent and distort the occupational distribution of the latter.

The South-East Europeans include the Croatians, Serbians, Italians, Greeks, Hungarians, Polish, Portuguese, and Ukrainians.

The non-European category includes Chinese, Africans, and all others who are not included in the above four categories. Even though these ethnic groups do not belong to the same geographic region, they have some common criteria such as their status as visible minorities and their relatively more recent period of immigration to Canada compare to the European ethnic groups. Moreover, the Non-European ehtnic categories are numerically too small to be identified as independent categories. So they have been collapsed under one

category and labelled as Non-European.

Multiple identity includes those ethnic groups who reported more than one ethnic origin. Since these members appear to identify with more than one ethnic origin they will be referred to as members with multiple identity.

c.Home Language:

Home Language refers to the specific language spoken at home by the respondent at the time of the Census. If more than one language was spoken, then the language most often spoken by the respondent was entered. This variable is different from mother tongue which refers to the language first learned in childhood and which is still understood by the respondent. Since home language refers to the actual use of the variable, it is regarded as a more valid indicator for our purpose. This variable has been recoded into three categories, i.e. English, French, and others. This variable has been further transformed into dummy variables for the regression analyses.

d.Place of Birth:

Place of birth refers to the country in which the respondent was born. A total of thirty-two categories are provided for this variable. These categories are included in Appendix A. For the present study however, this variable has been dichotomized in terms of native-born and foreign-born. Hence this variable is referred as nativity.

e.Highest Level of Schooling:

Highest level of schooling refers to the highest grade or years of elementary school, secondary school or university, ever attended; and whether or not additional training in the form of vocational, or post-secondary non-university was present. Those currently enrolled were asked to report their present year or grade. The 1981 Census provides 11 categories for this variable. (See Appendix A). The number of years of schooling more clearly indicates one's level of education, a term which will be used in the rest of the study.

f.Occupation:

Occupation refers to the specific kind of work the person did on the job as determined by self report,including the description of the most important duties and the job title. Sixteen categories of this variable have been entered by the 1981 Census, based on the Canadian Classification and Dictionary of Occupation. These categories are known to have a 'desirable degree of homogeneity with respect to the kind of work performed'. However Pineo, Porter and McRoberts (1977) in their attempt to reassess the validity of these categories,found some limitations in terms of homogeneity within each of them. They concluded that aggregating these sixteen groups of occupation into three categories on the basis of mean prestige score and standard deviations derived from Pineo and Porter's 1967 study would make these categories more valid in terms of their homogeneity. The present study will aggregate the occupational categories into the three categories identified by Pineo Porter and McRoberts (1977). These categories are as follows:

upper white collar

clerical, sales and service

crafts, trades and manual

In this study these categories have been identified as high status occupations, medium status occupations and low status occupations respectively.

g.Total Income:

Total income refers to the sum of money received during 1980 by an income receipient from the following sources:

wage and salaries, net income from non-farm self employment, net income from farm self employment, old age pension, family allowances, unemployment insurance benefits, other government payments, investment income, retirement pensions and other money income. Income has been entered in thousands of dollars and ranges from no income to $100,000 or higher. Individuals immigrating to Canada in 1981 have zero income. Also, all individuals in Hutterite Colonies were assigned zero. This variable was entered as a continuous variable in

this study.

h.Age at Immigration:

Age at immigration refers to the actual age of the respondent upon arrival in Canada. For the 1981 census this variable has been collapsed into six age groups, which are as follows: 0-4 years; 5-12 years, 13-19 years; 20-34 years; 35-64 years; 65 years and over. The same categories are being used in this study.

i.Period of Immigration

Period of immigration refers to the year when the respondent arrived in Canada which is categorized as follows:

00	Not Applicable (inmates and persons who were Canadian citizens by birth)
01	Before 1946
02	1946-1955
03	1956-1960
04	1961-1965
05	1966
06	1967-1970
07	1971
08	1972
09	1973
10	1974
11	1975
12	1976
13	1977
14	1978

15 1979

16 1980

17 1981

In the rest of the study this variable will be referred to as "Length of Residence"

j.Sex:

Sex refers to the gender of the respondent and has been entered as a dichotomy. The value of 1 refers to female and 2 refers to male respondents.

k.Mobility Status:

Mobility status is based on the comparison between a person's usual place of residence on Census day and his or her residence five year earlier. On the basis of this relationship, the population is classified as "movers" and "non-movers". Non-movers are persons who on Census day were living in the same dwelling they occupied five years earlier. The category of movers is further divided into five categories, all of which appear in Appendix A. For the persent study, this variable has been dichotomized between movers and non-movers.

l. Family Size:

A family refers to a husband and wife (with or without children) who have been married regardless of age; or a lone parent of any marital status with one or more children regardless of age living in the same dwelling. For Census purposes, persons living in a common-law type of arrangement are considered as now married regardless of their legal marital status. Thus, size of family refers to the number of persons in such family units. For the present study, this variable has been entered as an ordinal variable with ten categories all of which appear in Appendix A.

m.Socioeconomic status:

Socioeconomic status is a composite variable that has been computed by including occupation, level of education, and total income of the respondent. A factor analysis of these three variables, i.e. occupation, income, and level of education was then carried out. The scores from the factor analyses were then represented as the socioeconomic status scores.

n. Proportion of Minority Groups:

This variable is based on a dichotomy between the members of British and all other ethnic groups. The members of the British group are regarded as the dominant group whereas all other ethnic groups are regarded as minority groups. The French ethnic group, despite their charter status, has been combined with other minority groups, mainly because the former is under-represented in the Canadian power structure (Clement 1975) and the upper social class (Porter 1965). There is however, some exception regarding the status of the French ethnic group in the province of Quebec, where it occupies a high position in political and social institutions (Breton 1980). Studies regarding inequality in socioeconomic status have indicated that the Anglophones occupy a much higher socioeconomic status than their Francophone counterparts (Morris and Lamphier 1974, Boyd 1985). Given the time frame whithin which such studies were undertaken, it remains to be seen to what extent such findings hold true.

In the present study, an attempt has been made to take this aspect into consideration. As will be seen in Chapter 6, in the analyses of the Census Metropolitan Areas of Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec where the proprotion of the French ethnic group is relatively larger than any other Census Metropolitan Areas included in this study, minority groups have been measured in three different ways. In the first case, the minority group includes all ethnic groups (including the French) who are not of British origin. In the second case, the minority group includes all ethnic groups including the British who are not of French origin. In the third case minority group includes all ethnic groups who are neither British nor French.

0. Percentage of Labour Force in Manufacturing Industries :

Manufacturing industries refer to one of the many industrial categories included in the 1981 Census. An industry is defined as a group of operating units, e.g companies or establishments, engaged in the same or similar kind of economic activity. Manufacturing industries includes 20 major groups which are as follows:
food, beverage, tobacco products, rubber, plastic products, leather industries, textile industries, knitting mills, clothing, wood industries, furniture and fixture, paper and allied industries, printing publishing and allied industries, primary metal industries metal fabricating industries, machinery industries, transportation equipment industries, electrical product industries, non-metallic mineral products industries, petroleum and coal products industries, chemical and chemical products industries and miscellaneous manufacturing industries.

3.2.2 The Analytical Technique

Five steps were involved in the analyses. In the first step multiple regression analyses were employed to examine the effect of ethnic and demographic variables on the socioeconomic status of ethnic groups at the national level. In the second step, analyses were carried out for the sample representing the foreign-born group. In the third step, the analyses were focussed on the sub-samples representing the six ethnic groupings. In the fourth stage, samples representing the thirteen Census Metropolitan Areas were analysed. For these CMAs ecological variables were also included along with the set of ethnic and demographic variables for examining their influence on socioeconomic status. In the fifth stage, a breakdown procedure was employed to examine influence of city size in explaining variation in socioeconomic status.

3.3 The Aggregate Analyses

For the aggregate analyses, the thirteen CMAs were treated as units of analysis. Each of these Census Metropolitan Areas was treated as an observation, which provided a sample of only 13. To overcome the limitation of a small sample, each CMA was broken down by ten

age categories. These age categories range from 15-20, 21-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-40, 41-45, 46-50, 51-55, 56-60, to 61-65. This enabled us to increase our sample size from 13 to 130.

All the variables included for aggregate analyses were transformed into means or proportions. A detailed description regarding the transformation of these variables is provided below.

3.3.1 Operationalization of Variables

a. Ethnic Origin:

Ethnic origin is a nominal variable with six categories. For each observation included in the aggregate sample, the proportion of each category was entered. For example, the proportion of the British ethnic group belonging to the age group of 15 to 20 for a particular CMA would represent on observation. The second observation for this same variable would represent the proportion of the British ethnic group belonging to age group 21 to 25 for that same CMA, and so forth.

b. Home Language:

Home Language is also a nominal variable and is represented by three categories, i.e use of English, French and other langauges at home. Each of these categories are again represented in proportions.

c. Nativity:

Nativity was represented by including the proportion of foreign-born members.

d. Level of Education:

Level of education was represented by three variables. The first variable included the proportion of members with education of high school or lower. The second variable represented the proportion of members with education ranging from high school to pre-university. The third variable represented the proprotion of members with university

education or higher.

e. Occupation:

Occupation, like education, consisted of three variables, based on Pineo and McRoberts' classification (1977)of occupations. The first variable represents the proportion of members with low socioeconomic status. The second variable represented the proportion of members with medium socioeconomic status. The third variable represented the proportion of members with high socioeconomic status.

f. Total Income:

Total Income was represented by a trichotomy. The first category represented the proportion of members with an annual income of $1,999 or less. The second category represented the proportion of members with an annual income ranging from $2,000 to $9,999. The third variable was represented by the proportion of members with an income of $10,000 or higher. A cross-tabulation of education occupation and income was employed as a guideline to derive these above-mentioned cutting points.

h. Sex:

Sex was represented by including the proportion of male members.

i. Mobility Status:

Mobility status was measured by entering the proportion of members who are mobile.

j. Family Size:

Family size included the proportion of families with more than three members. The mean family size for most of the Census Metropolitan Areas (as will be seen later in Tables B-9 to B-21 in Appendix B) is about 3. Families with more than three members were considered as above average.

k. Socioeconomic Status:

Socioeconomic status was measured by combining the values of occupation, education and total income. The mean of this composite index was then entered as a score.

l. Proportion of Minority Groups:

Proportion of minority group was entered by including the proportion of those members who are neither British nor French.

On analyzing the CMAs of Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec where there is a relatively higher proportion of French compared to other CMAs, the proportions of minority groups were examined by employing three different measures (please see section 1 of this chapter regarding operationalization of variables for details). The differences in in the results of these three measures were negligible. For each of of the CMAs, i.e Ottawa, Montreal, and Quebec, the proportion of minority groups was found to be statistically insignificant. Therefore the proportions of minority groups who are Non-British and Non-French in origin were included in the analyses in order to maintain consistancy with the remaining CMAs. This measure was therefore employed at the aggregate level.

m. Proportion of Labour Force in Manufacturing:

Proportion of labour force in manufacturing was represented by including the proportion of labour force who are employed in manufacturing.

n. Size of Urban Centeres

Census Metropolitan Areas were employed for measuring the size of urban centres. As stated earlier (Section 1 of this chapter) thirteen census metropolitan areas have been included all of which have been ranked according to their population size.

3.3.2 The Analytical Technique

The procedure of multiple regression was employed for the analyses. As was the case for individual level analyses, socioeconomic status was treated as the dependent variable and all other variables were treated as independent variables. The analyses were carried out in two stages.

3.4 Scope and Limitations of This Study

This research meant to investigate a wide range of issues. But given certain constraints notably the nature of the available data set, priorities were given to some issues over others. As well, some limiting dscisions on research procedure had to be made. From this viewpoint, it is important to exmaine what this study meant to investigate and what were some of the limitations encountered.

A major limitation of this study concerns classification of ethnic groups. The 1981 Canadian Census identified twenty two ethnic categories which in this study, have been collapsed into six categories. By doing so, we have been restricted from identifying each of the twenty two ethnic groups as a distinctive entity. The generalizations derived from the classification of these six ethnic groupings are to some extent misleading. The six ethnic groups were identified on the basis of their chronological period of settlement as well as their broad geographic origin. However, within each of these groupings there are likely to be wide variations some of which are an artifact of the method used. For example, the Jews, who are often identified as a distinct ethno-religious group, have been included among the 'North West Europeans,' along with the Dutch, Scandinavians, and Germans. Even though the Jews were included in this category for good reasons (please see section 3.2.1 of this chapter) one should not overlook the confounding effects of this classification. Moreover, among the Jews included in this category, it is quite possible that many have originated from Poland, and U.S.S.R.; by geographic definition, they belong to the category 'South East Europe'. Therefore the results concerning this latter category also have their limitations.

Such limitations also hold true for the Non-European ethnic groups where, for example, seemingly different groups such as the African, Caribbean, and Chinese have been grouped under one category. Within the category 'South East European', again, there may be some methodologically produced variations influencing the results. For example, Chimbos (1974) in his comparative study of the Greeks and the Slovak immigrants in Ontario City found that compared to the Slovaks, the Greeks were more concentrated in occupational niches such as restuarant business which is a form of independent entrepreneurship. The Slovaks, on the other hand were found to be concentrated in low status and low income occupations. Similar variations may possibly exist for the South East European ethnic groups included in the present study, which have not been taken into consideration given the nature of the data available.

Another limitation of the study concerns the interchangeability of the terms ethnic and racial groups. Differences in the conceptualization of race and ethnicity should not be overlooked. Broadly speaking, race is defined in terms of phenotypical and genotypical traits which are biologically based. Nonetheless, Van den Berghe (1978) notes that scholars have often identified race on the basis of cultural differences. The concepts of race and ethnicity will differ to the extent that the former is regarded from a biological perspective but will be similar to the extent that it (race) is regarded from a cultural perspective. Based on this cultural commonality, to which Van den Berghe refers, the present study has used the terms race and ethnicity interchangeably.

The conceptual and methodological problems associated with use of ethnic origin, home language and nativity have been discussed earlier. An attempt has been made in this study to create a composite index of ethnicity based on the above three variables. However, due to multicollinearity among them, such an index could not be adopted. This remains an issue for the future to resolve.

An issue that has been overlooked in this study is the influence of religious background on socioeocnomic status. For example, Max Weber in his study of the Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism has pointed out how religious values must change before

there can be great changes in the economic order. Porter (1965:101), in his study of the Vertical Mosaic, notes that high incomes are related to Protestantism and lower incomes to Catholicism. However, religion as measured in the 1981 Canadian Census is only a reflection of one's religious affiliation. It does not allow us to tap information on one's degree of religiosity, or konwledge of religious beliefs and values, which may influence socioeoconomic status. Given this limitation, some important aspects of religion have not been taken into account in this research.

The definiton of family size as used by the 1981 Canadian Census appears to pose some problem in terms of examining its relationship with other variables. This definiton overlooks the possible differential effects of family size on family members.

The definition of mobility status as used by the 1981 Canadian Census has been another constraint in this study. Mobility status is based on the comparison between a person's usual place of residence on Census day and his or her residence five years earlier. Unfortunately, this dichotomy does not allow us to exmine the degree of mobility.

It was also the intent of this study to examine inequality in socioeconomic status over time. However, such longitudinal analyses could not be undertaken due to limited resources. The cross-sectional analyses of the present study have therefore restricted us from identifying trends and making long term predictions.

Another limitation encoutered in this study concerns ethnic inequality in socioeconomic status across CMAs. The intent of this study was to examine ethnic inequality in socioeocnomic status, across the CMAs. Instead, the study focussed at a more general level of inequality in socioeocnomic status across the CMAs. This restricts us from deriving generalizations regarding ethnic inequality in socioeconomic status across the CMAs.

The multiple regression analyses employed in this study, while an appropriate methodology, have been limited to examining additive effects only. Some of our findings indicated the possibility of interaction effects for explaining variation in socioeconomic status. For example, we observed earlier that both age and mobilty status on the whole had a relatively strong influence on socioeconomic status. Given the theoretical assumption that

geographic mobility is to a large extent dependent on age cohort, it would have been interesting to examine the interaction effect of age and mobiltiy status on socioeocnomic status. Likewise, the interaction effect of age at immigration and length of residence might explain variation in socieoconomic status aside from their independent effects. Aside from these sets of variables, a number of other variables have also indicated the possibility of interaction effects as we observed in earlier chapters. This aspect of interaction effects therefore needs to be taken into account in future research.

4. SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

The purpose of this chapter is to provide some backgound information regarding the history and sociodemographic characteristic of the sample. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first part deals with the historical background of the sample and the second part deals with the sociodemographic background of six relevant ethnic groups, namely, the British, French, North West Europeans, South East Europeans, Non-Europeans and those with multiple identity. A summary is provided in the third section.

4.1 Historical Background

The historical background of the six ethnic groups identified can be can be traced to British and French settlement. Basically, these were the the two pioneering group of settlers. These two groups, particularly the British ethnic group, determined the flow of other ethnic groups. The settlement of all six ethnic groups indicates variation in terms of their period and condition of settlement. Each of these ethnic groups will be dealt with sequentially.

4.1.1 The British Ethnic group

The members of the British ethnic group have been labelled as 'charter group' of the society and they maintain the right to make decisions about other groups (Porter 1965:60). From a theoretical perspective this group can then be identified as the dominant or the majority group. The historical background of this ethnic group can be traced back to the 17th century, when Henry Hudson landed on the Hudson Bay. Since then, there have been many ventures until trading posts were established in several areas. Meanwhile, colonies were set up along the Maritime Provinces. (Multicultural Directorate 1979) Many of these settlers were pouring in from the United States until after the American Revolution, when there was a

large influx of immigrants from Britain (Gibbons 1938). Further immigration of British settlers took place with the Confederation of States. Currently, the British constitute about 39.5% of the total population. (See Table 4-1).

Table 4-1 Percentage Distribution of Ethnic Groups in Canada, 1981

Ethnic Group	%
British	39.5
French	27.9
North West Euro	9.2
South East Euro	9.5
Non Euro	5.2
Mult Id	8.7
Total	100.00

4.1.2 The French Ethnic Group

The immigration of the members of the French ethnic group can be traced back to the beginning of the sixteenth century. The first group of immigrants were known to have settled in Acadia but gradually spread across the continent, towards the north in Quebec and Montreal, further inwards towards Ottawa and finally further west towards Manitoba and Saskatchewan (Multicultural Directorate 1979, Gibbons 1938). They constitute about 27.9% of

the total population.

4.1.3 The North West Europeans

The North West European group subsumes a number of ethnic groups. Overall, their period of migration can be traced back towards the end of the 19th century. Their immigration was encouraged because these immigrants were found to be culturally similar to the British ethnic group and were, therefore, easier to assimilate into the mainstream society. The immigration of this group into Canada, coincided with the expansion of the Canadian territories towards West, whereby more land was available for settlement. This composite group constitutes about 9.2% of the total population.

4.1.4 South East Europeans

Under this group, we have included the Croatians, Serbians Italians, Greeks, Hungarians, Polish, Portuguese, and Ukrainians. They comprise about 9.5% of the population. Their period of immigration to Canada varies from one group to another, but overall most of these groups migrated towards the end of the nineteenth century. These were the less preferred migrants since, they were considered to be of relatively poor stock and they were perceived not to assimilate easily into the main stream society. However, with the economic growth of the country there was a need for more labourers to work in mining industires and for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Immigrants from South East Europe were recruited largely to meet the requirement of cheap labour. While the economic needs of the country were fulfilled by recruiting these immigrants as cheap labourers, their very existence was simultaneously considered a liability. These immigrant groups had a drastically different culture from that of the British ethnic group who are also the dominant group. The ideology of Anglo Conformity enforced by the dominant group was not easily adopted by these South East European groups. Therefore, there was a gradual

decline in the recruitment of these immigrants.

4.1.5 Non-European Ethnic Group

More recently, with the need for a highly qualified labour force, there has been active recruitment of immigrannts from Non-European countries. The Non-European ethnic groups like the South East European groups, were a less desirable group since they were considered to be of relatively inferior race than immigrants from North West Europe. During the end of the 19th century, immigrants reepresenting these groups, particularly the Chinese, came to work for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But the immigration of these non-European group during that period was negligible. It was not until the beginning of 1960s that their immigration of this group into Canada was reinstated. Currently, this group constitutes about 5.2% of the total labour force.

4.1.6 Ethnic Groups with Multiple Identity

The settlement history of this group is not easliy apparent. Because of their multiple identity, we are confronted with the limitation of tracing their roots and their period of migration to Canada. They comprise about 8.7% of the total population.

4.2 Sociodemographic Characteristics

This section is further subdivided into six sub-sections in which the sociodemographic characteristics of the sample are discussed. The first two sections deal with age and sex distribution. Nativity and year of arrival are delineated in the next two sections. The fifth and the sixth sections focus on socioeconomic characteristics such as education and occupation

4.2.1 Distribution of Ethnic Groups by Age

Table 4-2 indicates the age distribution of ethnic groups. On the whole, a large percentage of the population are fairly young with 54.0% belonging to the age group of 15-34. Another 33.0% belong to the age range of 35-54. Only 13.0% belong to the age goup of 55-65. A similar age distribution is observed for each of the ethnic groups. The only exception is the group with multiple identity. A disproportionately large percentage of the population (70.9%) in this group are in the age range of 15-34. Similarly a disproportionately small percentage (6.0%) of the population in this group are in the age range of 55-65.

4.2.2 Distribution of Ethnic Groups by Sex

Table 4-3 indicates the distribution of ethnic groups by sex. Overall, there is very little variation in the pecentage distribution of ethnic groups by sex. Of the total population, 50.1% are females and 49.9% are males. The sex distribution of all the ethnic groups shows very little variation from this total pattern.

4.2.3 Nativity

Table 4-4 indicates the distribution of nativity among ethnic groups. An overwhelming majority of the population is native-born i.e. 82.1% as against 17.9% of foreign-born. An almost identical distribution is observed for the British ethnic group. The French ethnic group and the group with multiple identity have a relatively higher proportion of native-born (about 97.9% and 92.6% rspectively). The South East Europeans and the Non-Europeans have a much lower proportion of native-born members (49.7% and 45.9% respectively). Contrariwise, they have a relatively high proportion of foreign-born members (50.3% and 54.1% respectively). This high proportion of foreign-born immigrants among the South East Europeans and the Non-Europenas can be accounted for by the more liberal immigration policy adopted by the Canadian government, which opened the doors for more immigrants

TABLE 4-2 AGE DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNIC GROUPS

	British		French		N.W.Euro		S.E. Euro		Non Eur		Mult Id		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age														
15-24	35872	27.0	26950	29.1	7799	25.7	7579	24.2	7684	28.2	7051	41.8	92935	28.0
25-34	35416	26.6	23719	25.7	7285	24.0	7207	23.0	7836	28.8	4938	29.1	86473	26.0
35-44	22580	17.0	16911	18.4	5508	18.1	5937	19.0	5568	20.4	2417	14.3	58921	18.0
45-54	19429	14.7	13665	14.8	5370	17.8	5995	19.1	3689	13.5	1495	8.8	49643	15.0
55-65	19367	14.6	11042	12.0	4354	14.4	4572	14.6	2479	9.1	1015	6.0	42829	13.0
Total	132664	100.0	92359	100.0	30316	100.0	31290	100.0	27256	100.0	16916	100.0	330801	100.0

*Complete names of variables are not provided in this table and the following tables. Complete names of these abbreviated variables appear in Table A-1 (Appendix A).

TABLE 4-3 SEX DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNIC GROUPS

	British		French		N.W.Euro		S.E. Euro		Non Eur		Mult Id		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sex														
Male	665187	49.5	46510	49.5	15681	51.1	16365	51.7	13858	50.5	8306	48.2	166597	49.9
Female	666612	50.5	47034	50.5	14977	48.9	15269	48.3	13588	49.5	8936	51.8	166984	50.1
Total	131799	100.0	93184	100.0	30658	100.0	31634	100.0	27446	100.0	17242	100.0	333581	100.0

TABLE 4-4 DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNIC GROUPS BY NATIVITY

	British		French		N.W.Euro		S.E. Euro		Non Eur		Mult Id		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Nativity														
FB	16667	12.6	1988	2.1	8874	28.9	15907	50.3	14851	54.1	1270	7.4	59557	17.9
NB	115132	87.4	91196	97.9	21784	71.1	15727	49.7	12595	45.9	15972	92.6	272406	82.1
Total	131799	100.0	93184	100.0	30658	100.0	31634	100.0	27446	100.0	17242	100.0	333581	100.0

*FB is abbreviated form of foreign-born

NB is the abbreviated form of native born

from these geographic areas (Indra 1980).

4.2.4 Period of Arrival

Table 4-5 indicates that most of the immigrants (41.1%) arrived prior to 1960. Almost a quarter (28.6%) of the population arrived between 1961-70. Another quarter (29.0%) arrived in the next decade. The British ethnic group indicates a similar distribution pattern i.e a gradual decline from 46.8% before 1960 to 22.7% during 1971-1980. Those of South East European origin also indicate a gradual decline in the proportion of arrivals, from 47.0% before 1960, to 16.0% during 1971-80. In contrast, the Non-European group indicates a gradual increase in the percentage of immigrants from 14.8% before 1960 to 58.0% during 1971-1980.

4.2.5 Level of Education

Table 4-6 provides information regarding the level of education attained by each of these ethnic groups. On the whole, the distribution indicates that a predominantly large percentage of the population (58.6%) has a level of education that is equivalent to high school or below. Only 13.1% have attained education at university level or higher. The ethnic groups of British and North West European origin demonstrate a similar distribution pattern. The ethnic groups of French and South East European origin indicate a slightly higher proportion of members with low levels of education (62.6% and 64.2% respectively). They also have a relatively lower proportion (10.4%) of their population with university or higher level of education. In contrast to this, the Non-European ethnic group is characterized by a relatively higher proportion of their population with university or higher level of education. This can be accounted for by the fact that the immigration policy of the Canadian government called for recruiting more qualified immigrants in the 1960s and 1970s

TABLE 4-5 DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNIC GROUPS BY YEAR OF ARRIVAL

	British		French		N.W.Euro		S.E. Euro		Non Eur		Mult Id		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Before 1960	7698	46.9	698	36.0	6082	69.5	7465	47.0	2195	15.0	363	30.0	24501	41.4
1961-70	4849	29.5	608	31.0	1621	18.0	5795	36.5	3656	25.0	410	34.0	16939	28.6
1971-80	3733	22.7	600	31.0	1091	12.0	2551	16.0	8666	58.0	416	35.0	17057	29.0
'981	137	0.9	22	2.0	46	0.5	53	0.5	309	2.0	17	1.0	584	1.0
Total	16417	100.0	1928	100.0	8840	100.0	15864	100.0	14826	100.0	1206	100.0	59081	100.0

TABLE 4-6 DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNIC GROUPS BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION

	British		French		N.W.Euro		S.E. Euro		Non Eur		Mult Id		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High Schl or below	75683	57.5	42187	62.6	16383	53.4	20339	64.2	14742	53.6	9028	52.3	194605	58.6
Non-Unv	38449	29.1	25078	26.9	9689	31.5	8001	25.2	7416	27.0	5322	30.9	93955	28.3
Univ +	17667	13.4	9676	10.4	4586	15.0	3294	10.4	5288	19.2	2892	16.8	43403	13.1
Total	13179	100.0	93184	100.0	30658	100.0	31634	100.0	27446	100.0	17242	100.0	331963	100.0

4.2.6 Occupational Status

Occupation is an indicator of one's socioeconomic status. Therefore, for a better assessment of the social status of these ethnic groups, it is important to examine their occupational status. Table 4-7 shows the occupational distribution for these ethnic groups. The occupational categories are divided into high, medium and low status. The high status category represents professional groups. The medium status represents clerical, sales and service occupations, and the low status represents largely manual occupations. The total distribution indicates that 23.5% are represented in high status occupations. A much higher percentage is represented in medium status occupations and about 35.4% in low status occupations. With the exception of the South East Europeans, a similar pattern of distribution is exhibited by the other ethnic groups. For the South East Europeans, only 18% are represented in high status occupations and there is a much larger percentage than in the other groups (41.8%) represented in the low status occupations. In contrast, the group with multiple identity indicates a relatively high percentage of population in professional category (26.0%) and a relatively low percentage (30.0%) in low status occupations.

4.3 Summary

On the whole, the settlement pattern of these groups indicates a sequential flow of migration, starting with the British and French ethnic groups and continuing with a flow from Europe and Non-European countries. As far as the sociodemographic profile is concerned, some variation is observed among the ethnic groups, particularly, regarding the distribution of age, nativity, education and occupation. Such differences not only indicate the existence of ethnic groups as independent social units but also calls for examining the impact of such group variation on other structural components of the society such as socioeconomic status. The next three chapters will attempt to focus on this issue.

TABLE 4-7 DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNIC GROUPS BY OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

	British		French		N.W.Euro		S.E. Euro		Non Eur		Mult Id		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High Status	25759	24.6	15071	22.4	6254	24.9	4608	18.0	5246	24.4	3652	26.0	60590	23.5
Med Status	43922	42.0	27191	40.5	9619	38.3	10279	40.1	8592	40.0	6139	43.8	105739	41.0
Low Status	34684	33.2	24827	37.0	9234	36.7	10713	41.8	7611	35.4	4204	30.0	91273	35.5
Total	104365	100.0	67089	100.0	25104	100.0	25600	100.0	21449	100.0	13995	100.0	257602	100.0

5. VARIATION IN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

The earlier chapters provided information regarding the objectives of the study, the relevant research literature and the methodological procedures involved in this study. The next step is to concentrate on the findings which are provided in this and the following two chapters. This chapter is divided into four sections. The first part focusses on the national sample where the additive effects of ethnic affiliation and demographic variables, on socioeconomic status is examined. The next two sections deal with the sub-samples of the foreign-born group, and the six ethnic groups. The final section provides a summary and discussion of the findings.

5.1 The National Sample

In order to examine the influence of ethnic and demographic variables on socioeconomic status, multiple regression analyses were employed. Three different models were employed for the analyses, each of which will be presented sequentially.

5.1.1 Model One

In model one, the effects of ethnic affiliation on socioeconomic status is examined. Earlier, in chapter 2 section 2.5 it was hypothesized that ethnic affiliation has an influence on socioeconomic status. This hypothesis was tested in model one. Ethnic affiliation was represented by multiple indicators of ethnic origin, nativity, and language used at home. The results of model one are presented in Table B-1 (Appendix B) and Table 5-1. Table B-1 shows the zero order correlation matrix means and standard deviations of all the variables included for analyses at the national level. All variables appear to be statistically significant at .01 level.

Table 5-1 provides the results of multiple regression employed for model one. Overall, this model explains only 0.2% of the variation in socioeconomic status with an adjusted R^2 .020. Multicollinearity was observed between members of French ethnic group and use of French language at home (.856) and between use of French language and between use of English language at home (-.838). Since use of French as home language had multicollinearity with two other variables, it was therefore not included in the multiple regression analyses of the national sample. Variables representing ethnic origin are represented by six categories. But in the multiple regression equation, only five categories are included. The sixth category is treated as a base against which all other categories are compared. In a procedure of multiple regression,if a nominal variable has G categories, then G-1 categories are entered. (Gujarati 1978). Each of the categories representing a nominal variable is entered as a dummmy variable. Each of these dummy variables are represented by scores of 1 and 0. So that out of six categories of variables representing ethnic origin, one of them, in this instance, the category "non-European" ethnic origin, takes the value of 0 and is therefore not entered in the multiple regression equation. The value of this excluded category is interpreted from the constant or intercept of the multiple regression results. Likewise, use of home language is represented by three categorical variables. Namely, use of English as home language, use of French as home language and use of home language other than English and French. In this study, use of home language other than English and French has been treated as a base against which use of English and use of French as home language are compared.

It is apparent from Table 5-1 that the regression coefficients representing ethnic origin are negative. This means that variables representing ethnic origin are negatively associated with socioeconomic status. Moreover, it indicates that compared to the members of the non-European group, which is the reference group, the socioeoconomi status of the remaining five ethnic groups is relatively lower.

These unstandardized regression coefficients, do not indicate the relative strength of the independent variables in accounting for the variation in socioeconomic status. Since there are some differences in the units of measurement regarding the set of independent variables

TABLE 5-1 EFFECTS OF ETHNIC AFFILIATIN ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Variables	b	S.E.b	t	*B*
Ethnic Origin				
British	-.041	.005	-7.273	-.040
French	-.018	.006	-2.749	-.016*
N.W. Euro	-.011	.006	-1.737	-.006+
S.E. Euro	-.127	.006	-18.459	-.075
Mult Iden	-.047	.007	-6.693	-.026
Home Language				
English	.134	.004	32.980	.126
Nativity	.215	.007	29.295	.082
Constant	-.469	.021	-21.938	
Multiple R	.144			
R^2	.020			
Adjusted R^2	.020			
Standard Error	990			

+Statistically not significant

*Statistically significant at .05 level, all other coefficients are significant at .01 level.

included in this study, it is more appropriate to interpret the standardized coefficients or betas of the multiple regression analyses. With the exception of variables representing members of French ethnic origin and members of North West European ethnic origin, all other variables are statistically significant. Use of English as home language appears to be the most influential variable in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status, with a beta coefficient of .126. Nativity is the next most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status, with a beta coefficient of .082.

Variables representing ethnic origin appear to have a relatively weak influence on socioeconomic status. On the whole, the category of "South East European" ethnic origin appears to be the most influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status, with a beta coefficient of -.075. This is followed by British ethnic origin, with a beta coefficient of -.040. The influence of members with multiple ethnic identity on socioeconomic status is relatively weak, with a beta coefficient of -.026.

The results indicate that all three variables representing ethnicity, i.e ethnic origin, place of birth, and home language, have an influence in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. The results also verify earlier findings of Ornstein (1984) that place of birth and home language have a relatively stronger influence on socioeconomic status than ethnic origin. However, taken as a whole, the influence of ethnic affiliation in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status appears to be weak, as is apparent from R^2 and the regression coefficients. This finding indicates that ethnicity (inclusion of ethnic origin, nativity and use of home language as three independent variables) by itself is not very influential in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status. Other factors therefore need to be taken into account in order to explain variation in socioeconomic status.

Our next set of hypotheses (hypotheses 2 to 8, stated in Chapter 2 section 2.5), entail the examination of influence of some demographic variables on socioeconomic status. The next section of the chapter concentrates on analyses involved in testing these hypotheses. Two models were employed for this purpose, each of which are discussed below. These models are identified as models two and three in order to maintain the sequence from model one

discussed earlier.

5.1.2 Model Two

In this model, in additon to ethnic variables some demographic variables were introduced. The zero order correlation matrix, means proportions and standard deviations of all the variables included in the analyses are provided in Table B-1 in Appendix B. In addition to the multicollinearity between the set of variables mentioned earlier in model one, multicollinearity was also observed between level of education and socioeconomic status (.746). Therefore, level of education as an independent variable was not included in this model.

Table 5-2 presents the results of the multiple regression. On the whole, only 8% of the variance is explained by these variables. The t values indicate that all the variables are statistically significant.

The set of independent variables included in the analyses, can be broadly dichotomized under two headings. Namely, ethnic variables, and demographic variables. The findings of this study from hereafter will therefore be presented under these two broad headings.

5.1.2.1 Ethnic Variables

Of all the ethnic variables, use of home language appears to be the most important variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status (*B*.117). In fact it is the second most influential variable among the entire set of independent variables in this model. The positive sign indicates that with an increase in the proportion of members who use English as home language, the socioeconomic status also rises.

The influence of nativity (*B*.067) in explaining variation in socioeconomic status is relativley weak. The positive association between the two variables indicates that with an increas in the proportion of members who are foreign-born, the socioeconomic status rises more than with an increase in the proportion of members who are native-born.

TABLE 5-2 EFFECTS OF SOME ETHNIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS.

Variables	b	S.E.b	t	β
Ethnic Variables				
British	-.052	.005	-9.502	-.051
French	-.031	.006	-4.828	-.028
N.W. Euro	-.023	.006	-3.611	-.013
S.E. Euro	-.131	.006	-19.573	-.077
Multiple	-.061	.006	-8.835	-.033
Nativity	.174	.007	24.219	.067
English Language	.125	.003	31.564	.117
Demographic Variables				
Age	.004	.000	25.400	.065
Sex	.394	.004	83.142	.197
Family	-.045	.001	-24.092	-.061
Mobility	.231	.005	44.957	.115
Constant	-1.409			
	.025	-54.212		
Multiple R	.284			
R^2	.081			
Adjusted R^2	.081			
Std. Error	.959			
DF	11/333563			
F	1310.745			

All coefficients are statistically significant at .01 level.

The variables representing ethnic origin also appear to have a relatively weak influence on socioeconomic status, compared to use of English as home language. All coefficients are negative, indicating that with an increase in the proportion of members in each of these ethnic groups, the socioeconomic status declines. For example the regression coefficient (unstandardized) for members of the British ethnic group is -.052; that of members representing the French ethnic group is -.031; that of members representing the North West European ethnic group is -.023; that of members of the South East European ethnic group is -.131; and that of members of with multiple ethnic identity is -.061. It is also interesting to note that compared to members of the non-European group, the socioeconomic status of the remaining five ethnic group is relativley low.

Among the five ethnic groupings which are included as independent variables in this model, the South East European ethnic origin appears to have the strongest influence on socioeconomic status, with a beta coefficient of (-.077). This is followed by, members of British ethnic origin (*B*-.051) and multiple ethnic identity (*B*-.033). Members of French ethnic origin (*B*-.028) and those of North West European ethnic origin (*B*-.013) have relatively weak influence on socioeconomic status, meaning that with an increase in the proportion of these two ethnic groups decline in socioeconomic status is not as sharp as with an increase in the proportion of members of the other three ethnic groups particularly the South East European group.

5.1.2.2 Demographic Variables

Among the demographic variables, sex appears to be the most important variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status with the highest beta coefficient (*B*.197). This means that with an increase in the proportion of male members, there is a concomitant rise in the socioeconomic status.

Mobility status is the next most influential variable (*B*.115) in explaining variation in socieconomic status. The positive association between the two variables indicates that the socioeconomic status rises with an increase in the proportion of

members who are mobile and that this rise in socioeconomic status is relatively higher with an increase in the proportion of members who are mobile than with an increase in the proportion of members who are not mobile.

Age (*B*.065) appears to be a relatively weak variable in influencing socioeconomic status compared to sex and mobility status. The positive sign of the beta coefficient for age indicates that the socioeconomic status rises with an increase in the proportion of the older age group. This finding is contrary to our hypothesis (See Chapter 2, section 2.5 hypothesis 3). The influence of family size on socioeconomic status is even weaker (*B*-.061) than that of age. The negative association between family size and socioeconomic status indicates that with an increase in the proportion of members with large family size there is a decline in socioeconomic status.

5.1.3 Model Three

In model three, occupational status, which is a component of socioeconomic status, is treated as the dependent variable. Level of education is an additional variable included in this model, along with the set of variables that were included in model one. It was found earlier in the zero order correlation matrix that multicollinearity existed between level of education and socioeconomic status (Table B-1 Appendix B). For this reason, level of education as an independent variable had to be excluded from our analyses in model two. In order to overcome this limitation, level of education has been included as an independent variable in this model. Occupational status, though not truly representative of socioeconomic status, has nevertheless some validity as an index of socioeconomic status. Moreover, the zero order correlation matrix in Table B-1 (Appendix B) indicates that there is no multicollinearity between level of education and occupational status, as was the case between level of education and socioeconomic status.

Table 5-3 presents the results of model three. Here the R^2 increased from .081 in model two to .154 in model three. The t values indicate that with the exception of variables

TABLE 5-3 EFFECTS OF SOME ETHNIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

Variables	b	S.E.b	t	*B*
Ethnic Variables				
British	-.011	.006	-1.790	-.009+
French	.005	.008	.623	.003+
N.W. Europeans	.016	.007	2.366	.007*
S.E.Europeans	.058	.027	7.087	.027
Multiple Iden	-.032	.008	-3.877	-.014
Nativity	.062	.008	7.014	.019
English Language	.065	.006	9.577	.049
Demographic Variables				
Level of Education	.420	.004	91.577	.212
Age	-.004	.002	-22.281	-.055
Sex	.684	.005	120.065	.273
Family	-.060	.002	-26.975	-.065
Mobility	.119	.006	19.268	.047
Constant	.703	.031	22.166	
Multiple R	.392			
R^2	.154			
Adjusted R^2	.154			
Std Error	1.150			
DF	12/333563			
F	2292.607			

+Statistically not significant.

*Statistically significant at .05 level all other coefficients are significant at .01 level.

representing members of British and French ethnic origin, all other variables are statistically significant.

5.1.3.1 Ethnic Variables

On the whole, the variables representing ethnic affiliation appear to be weak in accounting for variation in occupational status. However, it is worth noting that English as home language emerges as relatively more influential in explaining variation in occupational status, with a beta coefficient of .049. This is followed by nativity (*B*.019). The coefficients are postive in each case indicating that with an increase in the proportion of members who use English as home language and with an increase in the proportion of members who are foreign-born, there is a rise in socioeconomic status. This finding is consistent with the findings of model two.

Variables representing ethnic origin indicate relativley weak influence on socioeconomic status. With the exception of members of British (b-.011,*B*.-.009) and French ethnic origin, (b.005),*B*.003), all other variables representing ethnic origin are statistically significant. The variables pertaining to North West European ethnic origin (b .016,*B.007*) and South East European ethnic orign (b.058,*B*.027), show a positive association with occupational status. In contrast the variables pertaining to the ethnic group with multiple identity indicate a negative association with occupational status.

5.1.3.2 Demographic Variables

Among the demographic variables, sex is again found to be the most influential variable in explaining variation in occupational status (*B*.273), followed by level of education (*B*.212). Contrary to the findings of model two, where the influence of family size on socioeconomic status was the weakest, in model three, family size appears to be the third most important variable in explaining variation in occupational status (*B* -.065). The association between the two variables is again negative, indicating that with an

increase in the proportion of members with large family size, the occupational status declines. Age is the next most important variable (*B*-.055) in explaining variation in occupaational status, followed by mobility status (*B*.047). The negative association between age and occupational status lends support to our earlier hypothesis that socioeconomic status rises with an increase in the proportion of members of younger age group. The positive association between mobility status and socioeocnomic status also confirms our earlier hypothesis regarding these two variables.

5.1.4 Model Four

In model four, an attempt was made to examine the influence of ethnic and demographic variables on level of education. It was hypothesized earlier that the effect of ethnic affiliation on socioeconomic status is influenced to a large extent by level of education. Therefore, in this model, level of education is treated as a dependent variable, whereby the influence of ethnic affliation, controlling for a number of demographic variables, is examined. The results of this model are presented in Table 5-4. On the whole, this model explains very little variance in level of education. The t values indicate that with the exception of the variable representing multiple identity, all other variables are statistically significant.

5.1.4.1 Ethnic Variables

Among the ethnic variables, use of English as a home language appears to have the strongest influence on level of education, with a beta coefficient of .174. Nativity indicates a relatively weak coefficient (*B*.098). The variables representing ethnic origin indicate a negative association with level of education. But this negative association is strongest for the French ethnic group (*B*-.102), followed by South East European ethnic origin (*B*-.066).

TABLE 5-4 EFFECTS OF SOME ETHNIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Variables	b	S.E.b	t	β
Ethnic Variables				
British	-.036	.003	-10.094	-.056*
French	-.072	.004	-15.725	-.102*
N.W. Europeans	.019	.004	-4.551	-.017*
S.E. Europeans	-.071	.004	-16.100	-.066*
Mult Id	-.013	.004	-2.978	-.011+
Nativity	.161	.004	33.661	.098 *
English Language	.118	.003	32.147	.174*
Demographic Variables				
Age	-.003	.000	-26.417	-.069*
Sex	.063	.003	20.583	.049*
Family Size	-.032	.001	-27.057	-.070*
Mobility Status	.121	.003	36.580	.095*
Constant	1.292	.016	76.883	
Multiple R	.204			
R^2	.041			
Adjusted R^2	.041			
Std Error	620			
DF	11/333563			
F	592.086			

+Statistically not significant all other coefficients are statistically significant at .01 level.

5.1.4.2 Demographic Variables

Among the demographic variables, mobility status appears to be the most influential variable in explaining variation in level of education (*B*.095), followed by family Size (*B*-.070). Age indicates a relatively weak negative association (*B*-.069) with level of education. The influence of sex on level of education (*B*.049) appears to be the weakest. This contrasts with the influence of sex and age on socioeconomic status, where they appear to be the most influential variables. On the whole, use of English as a home language appears to be the most influential variable in accounting for variation in level of education.

5.2 Sample of Foreign-Born Group

So far, the analyses were focussed at the national level. This section deals with the sub-sample of foreign-born ethnic groups. In this case, two different models are employed, each of which will be considered separately.

5.2.1 Model One

Model one here is almost identical to model two of the national sample. In this model analyses related to the foreign-born group differ from that of earlier analyses, in that they encompass two additional variables, namely, age at immigration and length of residence. Table 5-5 provides the results of this model. With the exception of use of French at home, all coefficients are statistically significant. On the whole, the variables in this model explain about 18.0% of variance in socioeconomic status.

5.2.1.1 Ethnic Variables:

Among the ethnic variables, use of English as a home language emerges as the most important variable in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status (B.199). In fact it is the third most important variable (among the entire set of independent variables

TABLE 5-5 EFFECTS OF SOME ETHNIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF FOREIGN-BORN GROUP

Variables	b	S.E.b	t	B
Ethnic Variables				
British	.219	.005	40.414	.186
French	.219	.013	16.794	.081
N.W.Euro	-.066	.014	-4.556	-.055
S.E. Euro	-.094	.019	-4.759	-.031
Mult Iden	-.065	.015	-4.344	-.065
English Language	.241	.014	16.196	.199
French Language	.006	.014	.460	.005
Demographic Variables				
Age	-.012	.000	-24.327	-.155
Sex	.587	.008	71.978	.272
Family	-.044	.003	-13.797	
Mobility	.163	.009	17.627	.075
Ageimmig	.174	.005	33.233	.199
Length of Residence	-.057	.001	-35.882	-.227
Constant	-.749	.055	-13.612	
Multiple R	.425			
R^2	.181			
Adjusted R^2.	180			
Standard Error				
.974				
D F	13/57244			
F	974.211			

All coefficients are statistically significant at .01 level

included in this model) in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. The beta cooefficient for the association between use of French as a home language and socioeconomic status is statistically insignificant. The positive association between use of English as home language and socioeconomic status indicates that the socioeconomic status rises with an increase in the proportion of members who speak English, in contrast to a decline in socioeconomic status with an increase in the proportion of members whose home language is neither English nor French.

Among the variables representing ethnic origin, the members of the British (b .219) and the French ethnic origin (b .219) indicate a positive association with socioeconomic status. In contrast, negative associations are indicated for North West European ethnic origin (b -.066); South East European ethnic origin (b-.094); and those with multiple identity (b -.063)

The standardized coefficients of variables representing ethnic origin indicate that the influence of British ethnic origin on socioeconomic status (*B*.196) is much stronger than that of the remaining variables representing ethnic origin. The positive association between British ethnic origin and socioeconomic status indicates that in the sample represented by members of the foreign born group, an increase in the proportion of members of British ethnic origin is strongly associated with an increase in socioeconomic status. The members of French ethnic origin also show a positive association with socioeconomic status (*B*.081). But the beta coefficient of this variable is not as high as in the case of British ethnic origin.

The beta coefficients for the variables representing the remainder of the ethnic groups are negative: i.e members representing the North West European origin (*B*-.055), the South East European ethnic origin (*B*-.031), and those with mulitple ethnic identity (*B*-.065). This indicates that in the foreign-born sample, socioeconomic status declines with an increase in the proportion of members of the aforementioned groups.

5.2.1.2 Demographic Variables

Among the demographic variables, sex is again the most important variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status, with a beta coefficient of .272, followed by length of residence (*B*-.227). The association between length of residence and socioeconomic status, though negative, actually indicates that with an increase in proportion of members with longer length of residence, the socioeconomic status rises. Chapter 3 and Appendix A indicate that length of residence has been coded by entering the actual year of immigration of the members of the foreign-born group. The values assigned to the years increased sequentially from the earliest year of arrival to the latest or most recent year of arrival. This finding supports our hypothesis that socioeconomic status rises with an increase in length of stay.

Age at immigration is the next most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status (*B*.199). The positive association between age at immigration and socioeconomic status indicates that with an increase in age at immigration, the socioeconomic status rises. This finding contradicts our hypothesis (stated earlier in Chapter 2 section 2.5 hypothesis 4)

Age also appears to have a fairly strong influence on socioeconomic status (*B*-.155), ranking as the next most important variable. The association between age and socioeconomic status is negative. This indicates that for members of the foreign-born group, socioeconomic status declines with an increase in the proportion of the older age group

Mobility status (*B*.075) and family size (*B*-.054) have a relatively weak influence on socioeconomic status compared to the variables discussed earlier. However, the positive association between mobility and socioeconomic status and the negative association between family size and socioeconomic status are in the direction predicted by our hypotheses.

5.2.2 Model Two

Model two is identical to model three used for the analysis of the national sample (with the exception of including two additonal variables, namely, length of residence and age at immigration). Occupational status is treated as the dependent variable. All other variables including level of education, are treated as independent variables. Table 5-6 depicts the results of the analyses carried out for model two. About 14.0% of the variance in occupational status is explained by all the variables included in this model. With the exception of mobility status and ethnic groups of British, French and North West European origin, all other variables are statistically significant. The results are again presented under two headings, namely ethnic variables and demographic variables. On the whole the influence of demographic variables on socioeconomic status is much stronger than the influence of ethnic variables.

5.2.2.1 Ethnic Variables:

Among the ethnic variables, South East European ethnic origin is the only variable that appears to be statistically significant. The positive association between South East European ethnic origin with socioeconomic status (b .086, *B*.070) indicates that with an increase in the proportion of members of South East European ethnic origin, the occupational status rises.

5.2.2.2 Demographic Variables

Among the demographic variables, sex appears to be the most powerful in explaining variation in occupational status (*B*.335), followed by age (*B*-.201). The association between age and occupational status is negative, indicating that among the members of the foreign-born group, the higher the proportion of older members, the lower the occupational status.

Age at immigration is the next most influential variable in explaining variation in occupational status (*B*-.161), indicating that occupational status rises with an increase in

TABLE 5-6 EFFECTS OF SOME ETHNIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF FOREIGN-BORN ETHNIC GROUP

Variables	b	S.E.b	t	B
Ethnic Variables				
British	.010	.014	-.686	-.008*
French	-.034	.018	-1.901	-.011*
N.W. Euro	-.028	.015	-1.883	.018*
S.E.Euro	.086	.015	5.746	.070
Mult Iden	.017	.014	1.188	.014*
English Language	.005	.005	.976	.004*
French Language	-.034	.018	-1.901	-.011
Demographic Variables				
Ageimmig	.143	.005	27.009	.161
Level of Education	-.069	.001	-37.049	-.152
Length of Residence	-.030	-.001	-19.052	-.118
Age	-.016	.000	-31.749	-.201
Sex	.728	.008	87.529	.335
Family	-.025	.003	-7.663	-.030
Mobility	.011	.009	1.237	.005*
Constant	1.381	.055	24.880	
Multiple R	.383			
R^2	.146			
Adjusted R^2	.146			
Standard Error	1.003			
DF	13/59543			
F	78?.726			

With the exception of the coefficients in asterisk all other coefficients are statistically significant at .01 level

the proportion of members who arrived in Canada at a relatively older age.

Level of education is the next most influential variable in accounting for variation in occupational status (*B*.152), indicating a decline in occupational status with an increase in the level of education. This negative association is contraary to our earlier hypothesis which indicated that level of education is positively associated with socioeconomic status. (See Chapter 2 Section 2.5 hypothesis 2).

Length of residence also appears to have a fairly strong influence on occupational status (*B*.-118) indicating that a rise in occupational status of members of the foreign-born group is associated with longer length of residence.

The influence of family size (*B*-.030) on occupational status is weak, with a negative sign, indicating a decline in occupational status with an increase in the proportion of members with large family size.

The influence of mobility on occupational status (*B*.005) is the weakest among all the variables.

5.3 Sub-Samples of Ethnic Groupings

In this section the analysis is focussed on sub-samples representing the six ethnic groupings, namely, the British, the French, the North West Europeans, the South East Europeans, the non-Europeans and those with multiple ethnic identity. Each of these sub-samples will be treated sequentially in detail.

The zero order correlations, means, proportions and standard deviations of each of these sub-samples are provided in Tables B-3 to B-8 in Appendix B.

5.3.1 The British Ethnic Group

The results of the analyses pertaining to the British ethnic group appear in Table 5-7. All coefficients are statistically significant. Because of multicollinearity between use of English

TABLE 5-7 EFFECTS OF SOME ETHNIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF BRITISH ETHNIC GROUP

Variables	b	S.E.b	t	B
Ethnic Variables				
English Language	.026	.010	2.480	.006*
Nativity	.220	.008	26.939	.072*
Demographic Variables				
Age	.000	.000	42.324	.122
Sex	.405	.005	75.369	.200
Family	-.033	.002	-15.329	-.043
Mob	.263	.005	45.293	.130
Constant	-1.413	.022	-62.823	
Multiple R	.278			
R^2	.077			
Adjusted R^2	.077			
Standard Error	.969			
DF	6/130104			
F	1818.043			

* Statistically significant at .05 level.
All other coefficients are significant at .01 level.

and use of French language at home, (-.945) two independent analyses were carried out. In the first analysis, use of English language at home was excluded and in the second analysis, use of French language at home was excluded from the multiple regression equation.(See Table B-3 in Appendix B). The findings from the second analysis involving the use of English as home language are reported in Table 5-7 since the regression coefficient of the use of English as home language was relatively higher than that reported for French as home language. Also, the adjusted R^2 was found to be relatively higher when use of English as home language was included in the multiple regression equation, than when use of French language at home was included.

All the variables included in the analyses are statistically significant. These variables taken together, explain about 7% (adjusted R^2.077) of the variance in socioeconomic status.

5.3.1.1 Ethnic Variables:

Ethnic variables are represented by nativity and use of English as home language. Between the two variables, nativity is more influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status (*B*.072) than use of English as home language (*B*.006). The positive association between nativity and socioeconomic status indicates that, for British ethnic group, with an increase in the proportion of foreign-born members there is an increase in socioeconomic status.

5.3.1.2 Demographic Variables

Similar to earlier results, sex appears to be the most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status of the British ethnic group, with a beta coefficient of .200. Mobility status is the next most influential variable in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status, with a beta coefficient of .130; followed by age with a beta coefficient of .122. Family size appears to be the weakest variable in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status with a negative beta coefficient of -.043 indicating that

with an increase in the proportion of members with large family size, there is a decline in socioeconomic status.

5.3.2 The French Ethnic Group

The French ethnic group was the next sub-sample that was examined in this study. The zero order correlation matrix for this sample (See Table B-4 in Appendix B) indicated mulitcollinearity between use of English as the home language and use of French as home language (-.993). Two independent multiple regression analyses were carried out as has been done for members of the British ethnic group. The analyses which included use of English as the home language found this variable to be statistically insignificant. Therefore, the analyses which included use of French as home language are reported in this study.

Table 5-8 presents the results of multiple regression analyses for this sample. All variables are statistically significant with the exception of age. About 6% (adjusted R^2.060) of the variance in socioeconomic status is explained by this model.

5.3.2.1 Ethnic Variables

As in the previous sample, only two variables are included to represent the ethnic variables. In this sample, however, the use of French language instead of English as home language has been included. Like the findings of the previous sample, nativity has a relatively stronger influence (B.049) in explaining variation in socioeconomic status than the use of French as home language (B-.010). The beta coefficient for use of French as home language is not only weak but also negative, indicating that with an increase in the proportion of members of the French ethnic group who use French as home langauge, the socioeconomic status declines.

TABLE 5-8 EFFECTS OF SOME ETHNIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF FRENCH ETHNIC GROUP

Variables	b	S.E.b	t	*B*
Ethnic Variables				
French	-.013	.004	-3.247	-.010**
Nativity	.327	.021	15.500	.049*
Demographic Variables				
Age	-.000	.000	-1.4666	-.004+
Sex	.371	.006	60.900	.194*
Family	-.045	.002	-.18.556	-.064*
Mob	.205	.006	30.897	.107*
Constant	-1.159	.030	-38.639	
Multiple R	.245			
R^2	.060			
Adjusted R^2	.060			
Standard Error	.923			
DF	6/91939			
F	979.940			

+ Statistically not significant.

** Statistically significant at .05 level all other coefficients are significant at .01 level.

5.3.2.2 Demographic Variables

On the whole, the influence of demographic variables in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status is relatively stronger than the influence of ethnic variables. Among the demographic variables, sex is most important (*B*.194), followed by mobility (*B*.107). Influence of family size (*B*-.064) in explaining variation in socioeconomic status is relatively weak.

5.3.3 North West European Ethnic Grouping

The third sub-sample included in this study covers the North West European ethnic grouping. Table 5-9 shows the results of multiple regression analyses for this sub-sample. All coefficients are statistically significant. About 9% (adjusted R^2.091) of the variance in socioeconomic status is explained by the set of independent variables included in this model.

5.3.3.1 Ethnic Variables

Of all ethnic variables, use of English as home language (*B*.121) is the most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. In fact it is the third most influential variable in the entire set. The positive association indicates that among the members of the North West European ethnic group, an increase in the proportion of members who use English as a home langauge is associated with a rise in socioeconomic status. Use of French as a home language also indicates a positive association with socioeconomic status, though the beta coefficient (*B*.067) is not as high as in the case of English as a home language (*B*.121). Nativity also appears to have a fairly strong influence on socioeconomic status (*B*.100) indicating that an increase in the proportion of members who are foreign-born is associated with a rise in socioeconomic status.

TABLE 5-9 EFFECTS OF SOME ETHNIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS . NORTH WESTERN ETHNIC GROUP

Variables	b	S.E.b	t	B
Ethnic Variables				
English Language	.223	.011	19.576	.121
French	.313	.027	11.451	.067
Nativity	.231	.013	16.875	.100
Demographic Variables				
Age	.005	.000	12.340	.075
Sex	.466	.011	40.799	.224
Family	-.032	.004	-7.124	-.041
Mob	-1.258	.012	22.149	.132
Constant	-1.258	.048	-26.003	
Multiple R	.278			
R^2	092			
Adjusted R^2	.091			
Standard Error	.991			
DF	7/30166			
F	437.480			

All coefficients are statistically significant at .01 level.

5.3.3.2 Demographic Variables

Among the demographic variables, sex emerges as the most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status (*B*.224), followed by mobility status (*B*.132). The two respective positive associations indicate that an increase in the proportion of male members is associated with a rise in socioeconomic status; and that with an increase in the proportion of members who are mobile there is a concomitant rise in the level of socioeconomic status.

The influence of age (*B*.075) in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status is relatively weak, and that of family size is even weaker (*B*-.041). The negative coefficient indicates that with an increase in the proportion of members with a large family there is a decline in socioeconomic status.

5.3.4 South East European Ethnic Grouping

Members of South East European origin were also treated as sub-sample within which the influence of some ethnic and demographic variables on socioeconomic status is examined. The results of multiple regression analyses are provided in Table 5-10. On the whole, this model explains about 14% (adjusted R^2.141) of the variance in socioeconomic status. All variables included in the model are statistically significant.

5.3.4.1 Ethnic Variables

Among ethnic variables, the use of English as home language appears to have a strong positive influence (*B*.239) on socioeconomic status. Use of French as a home language also indicates a positive but weaker association with socioeconomic status (*B*.066).

The role of nativity in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status is even weaker *B*-.016, with a negative coefficient. This indicates a decline in socioeconomic status with an increase in the proportion of members who are of foreign-born.

TABLE 5-10 EFFECTS OF SOME ETHNIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF SOUTH EAST EUROPEAN GROUP

Variables	b	S.E.b	t	*B*
Ethnic Variables				
English Language	.232	.006	37.168	.239
French	.221	.017	12.392	.066
Nativity	.031*	.012	-2.613	016*
Demographic Variables				
Age	-.001	.003	-4.053	-.023
Sex	.406	.009	40.841	.214
Family	-.058	.004	-14.324	-.080
Mobility	.204	.010	19.023	.106
Constant	-.569	.039	-14.549	
Multiple R	.376			
R^2	.141			
Adjusted R^2	.141			
Std. Error	.879			
DF	7/31371			
F	741.404			

*Significant at .05 level, all other coefficients are significant at .01 level.

5.3.4.2 Demographic Variables

Among the demographic variables, sex again emerges as the most influential variable (*B*.214) in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. Mobility status is the next most influential variable in accounting for variation (*B*.106) in socioeconomic status. Influence of family size (*B*-.086) and age (*B*-.023) are less influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. The negative coefficients for family size and age indicate that among the members of the South East European ethnic origin, the socioeconomic status declines with large families and with an increase in the proportion of older members.

5.3.5 Non-European Ethnic Grouping

The study now is focussed on a sample representing members belonging to the non-European ethnic group. The zero order correlation matrix for the variables included in the multiple regression analysis of this sub sample (see Table B-7 in Appendix B) indicates multicollinearity between the use of English as home language and the use of French as home language (.750). Therefore, two independent multiple regression analyses were carried out, as has been done earlier for the sub sample representing members of British ethnic origin. The model including the use of English as home language appeared to have a relatively high adjusted R^2 as well as a relatively high regression coefficient for use of English as a home language. Therefore, use of English rather than French as home language is reported in the findings of the present study.

Table 5-11 provides the results of the multiple regression analyses of this sub-sample. All variables included in the analyses are statistically significant and the adjusted R^2 (.109) indicates that 10% of variance in socioeconomic status is explained by the variables included in this model.

TABLE 5-11 EFFECTS OF SOME ETHNIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF NON-EUROPEAN ETHNIC GROUP.

Variables	b	S.E.b	t	B
Ethnic Variables				
English Language	.204	.006	29.827	.186
Nativity	.478	.013	35.406	.225
Demographic Variables				
Age	.006	.000	13.617	.081
Sex	.403	.012	33.223	.190
Family	-.052	.004	-11.988	-.071
Mobility	.118	.013	8.869	.054
Constant	-1.594			
	.043			
Multiple R	.331			
R^2	.110			
Adjusted R^2	.109			
Standard Error	.999			
DF	6/27097			
F	558.923			

All coefficients are significant at .01 level

5.3.5.1 Ethnic Variables

In contrast to the findings related to sub-samples discussed earlier, the results of this sample indicate that ethnic variables have a relatively stronger influence in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status than do demographic variables. Nativity (*B*.25) is the most influential variable in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status. Use of English as a home language also has strong influence on socioeconomic status (*B*.186). The positive association between nativity and socioeconomic status and between use of English as a home language and socioeconomic status indicate that for this sub-sample, the socioeconomic status rises with an increase in the proportion of members who are foreign-born; and with an increase in the proportion of members who use English as home language.

5.3.5.2 Demographic Variables

Among the demographic variables, sex (*B*.190) appears to be the most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. The influence of age (*B*.081), mobility status, (*B*.054) and family size (*B*-.071) on socioeconomic status is relatively weak.

5.3.6 Multiple Ethnic Identity

This section of the chapter concentrates on a sub-sample represented by members with multiple ethnic identity. Table 5-12 provides the results of multiple regression analyses carrried out for this sample. The zero order correlation matrix (See Table B-8 in Appendix B) of the variables included for this multiple regression analysis indicated multicollinearity between use of English and use of French as a home language (-.898). Therefore the same procedures undertaken earlier for the sub-sample of the British ethnic group, were repeated for this sub- sample. The adjusted R^2 was found to be slightly higher when use of English as a home language was included in the analyses. Therefore, the model including this variable i.e

TABLE 5-12 EFFECTS OF SOME ETHNIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF MEMBERS WITH MULTIPLE ETHNIC IDENTITY

Variables	b	S.E.b	t	β
Ethnic Variables				
English Language	.094	.017	5.330	.038
Nativity	.223	.027	8.001	.058
Demographic Variables				
Age	.018	.000	30.486	.229
Sex	.281	.014	19.418	.139
Family	-.087	.005	-15.605	-.121
Mobility	.251	.015	16.114	.124
Constant	-1.289			
	.023	-23.432		
Multiple R	.345			
R^2	.119			
Adjusted R^2	.119			
Standard Error	.943			
DF	6/16985			
F	384.496			

*All coefficients are statistically significant at .01 level.

use of English as a home language is reported in the findings. It is apparent from Table 5-12 that all variables included in this model are statistically significant. The adjusted R^2 (.119) indicates that about 11% of the variance in socioeconomic status is explained by the set of independent variables included in this model.

5.3.6.1 Ethnic Variables

Like the other sub-sample, nativity and use of home langauge have been included to represent ethnic variables. Nativity (*B*.058) has a relatively stronger influence in explaining variation in socioeconomic status than use of English as home language (*B*.038). The positive association between nativity and socioeconomic status indicates that socioeconomic status rises with an increase in the proportion of members who are foreign-born. The association between use of English as a home language and socioeconomic status is also positive, indicating that socioeconomic status rises more with an increase in the proportion of members who use English as a home language than with an increase in the proportion of members whose home language is other than English or French.

5.3.6.2 Demographic Variables

Among the demographic variables, age is the most influential variable (*B*.229) in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status. Sex (*B*.139) and mobility status (*B*.124) are the two next most influential variables in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. The regression coefficients are positive in each case. This indicates that for the sub-sample represented by members with multiple ethnic identity, socioeconomic status rises with an increase in proportion of male members, with an increase in members of the older age group, and with an increase in the proportion of members who are mobile. The influence of family size (*B*-.121) on socioeconomic status is again negative, meaning the socioeconomic status declines with an increase in the proportion of members with large

size families.

5.4 Summary and Discussion

The analyses, as observed earlier, were carried out at three different levels. The first part of the analyses was done at the national level, where the entire sample was the focus. The next part of the analyses dealt with a sample representing members who were born outside Canada. The third part of the analyses focussed on sub-samples representing members of six different ethnic groups.

Throughout the analyses, some consistent patterns emerged (please refer to Tables 5-1 to 5-12). Among the ethnic variables, use of English as a home language and nativity appear to be more influential variables than ethnic origin in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status

Use of English as a home language was a relatively weaker variable (B.125) in influencing socioeconomic status for the national level sample, than for the sub-samples representing members of the foreign-born group and members of the six ethnic groups (with the exception of the sub-samples representing members of the British ethnic group and of the multiple ethnic identity). The fact that use of English as home language had a relatively weak influence on socioeconomic status is not surprising. The members of the British ethnic group represent the dominant group in the Canadian society and English language happens to be the home language of this dominant group. Therefore for this group, very little variation is expected regarding use of English as home language. Chances are that most of them use English as home language which apparently is the mother tongue for most of the members of British ethnic origin.

This variable, i.e. use of English as a home language, appeared to have a fairly strong influence in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status for the sub-samples representing members of South East European and non-European ethnic groups. This means that for the members of these ethnic groups use of English language at home (which is also one of the

official languages of Canada) facilitates the attainment of high socioeconomic status.

Nativity appears to have a relatively weaker influence on socioeconomic status at the national than at the sub-sample level. This is more apparent for the sub-samples representing members of North West European and non-European ethnic groups. This suggests that while there is little discrepency in socioeconomic status between members of foreign-born and native-born groups at the national level, variation in socioeconomic status is quite apparent at finer levels of analysis carried out for certain sub-samples of ethnic groups.

The fact that both use of English as a home language and nativity are more influential than ethnic origin in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status, not only raises some ambiguity regarding the validity of employing ethnic origin as an indicator by itself for examining variation in socioeconomic status, but also establishes the validity of employing multiple indicators instead of single indicators.

The fact that use of English as a home language is the most influential variable in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status of the members of the foreign-born group, indicates that for these members instrumental factors such as use of English as a home language are more influential in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status than is demographic composition. Moreover, the fact that of the two official languages, the use of English as a home language had a much stronger positive influence on socioeconomic status than the use of French language reflects the national dominance of the British ethnic group. In fact for the members of the French ethnic group, use of French language shows an inverse relationship with socioeocnomic status. This indicates that despite the recognition of French as one of the official languages of Canada, along with English language, the former has relatively less salience for attaining high socioeconomic status than the latter. In fact, earlier studies such as those of Boulet and Veltman (1981), and Boyd (1981) have demonstrated that the socioeconomic status of the Francophones is relatively lower than that of the Anglophones. The finding of the present study reemphasizes the socioeconomic implications of language use.

It is also apparent from these findings that demographic variables are relatively more influential in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status than ethnic variables. For example Tables 5-2 and 5-4 which include both ethnic and demographic variables indicate that regression coefficients of demographic variables are relatively higher than that of ethnic variables and suggests that there is indeed some merit in including demographic variables in addition to ethnic variables for explaining variation in socioeconomic status.

Throughout the analyses, (with the exception of the sub-sample representing members of non-European ethnic origin), sex emerges as the most influential variable in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status. The positive association between sex and socioeconomic status throughout the analyses confirms our hypothesis (refer to Chapter 2, hypothesis 6) that with an increase in the proportion of male members, there is a concomitant rise in socioeconomic status. This holds true both for the national sample, representing society at large, as well as for the sub-samples representing members of ethnic groups and foreign-born groups.

In contrast to the strong influence of sex on socioeconomic status, the influence of family size on socioeconomic status appears to be the weakest throughout most of the analyses (with the exception of the sub-samples representing members of South East European and non-European ethnic groups). The consistent negative association between family size and socioeconomic status, confirms our earlier hypothesis (refer to Chapter 2, hypothesis 7), that the the socioeconomic status is likely to rise with an increase in the proportion of members with small families. Conversely, the socioeconomic status is likely to decline with an increase in the proportion of members with large family size.

Both for the national sample (Table 5-2) as well as the sub-samples (please refer to Tables 5-7 to 5-12), mobility status appeared to be the second most influential variable in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status. The consistent positive association between these two variables (mobility and socioeconomic status), confirms our relelvant hypothesis (see Chapter 2, hypothesis 8).

The influence of age in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status appears to be relatively weak compared to sex and mobility status. However, the positive association between age and socioeconomic status is contrary to our hypothesis (See Chapter 2, hypothesis 3). This contradiction holds true to the extent the influence of level of education is not included in the model. We find that the relationship between age and occupational status (which is a dimension of socioeconomic status) is negative when the effect of education is held constant. It was found that education has a strong positive influence on occupational status. Moreover, when level of education is treated as a dependent variable in model four of the national sample, we find a negative relationship between age and level of education, meaning that members of older age group have a relatively lower level of education. Thus based on the facts that education has a strong positive influence on socioeconomic status and that the older age group has a relatively lower level of education, the negative relationship between age and socioeconomic status is understandable.

Among the members of the foreign-born group, we find that age is negatively associated with socioeconomic status as well as with occupational status, which confirms our hypothesis (regarding age and socioeconomic status). This negative association between socioeconomic status and members of older age group is not necessarily indicative of the persistence of ethnicity in older age, but we are not entirely sure of that. Moreover, the fact that age is negatively associated with socioeconomic status for the foreign-born sub-sample may be reflective of the more recent immigration policy of Canada to recruit highly professional and skilled man power.

The association between socioeconomic status and age of immigrants upon arrival in Canada is positive, indicating that with an increase in the proportion of members whose age upon arrival in Canada is relatively older, there is a concomitant rise in socioeconomic status. As stated earlier, this positive association, is not in contrary to our earlier hypothesis (See Chapter 2, hypothesis 4). It may be that the arrival of relatively older immigrants coincided with a boom in the national and a correspondingly favourable labour market. It is quite likely that members who arrived in Canada at a relatively young age were also the ones who

immigrated as dependents along with their family. Consequently, their motivation to aspire for higher education or occupation was not as overwhelming as it was for those who arrived at a relatively older age and had to shoulder the responsibility of maintaining a family.

The association between length of residence of members representing the foreign-born group and socioeconomic status supports our hypothesis (see Chapter 2, hypothesis 5), indicating a rise in socioeconomic status with longer length of stay.

Influence of sex on socioeconomic status indicated results contrary to its influence on level of education. Sex was the most important variable for explainig variation in socioeconmic status. Contrary to this, the influence of sex on level of education was the least influential. The fact that sex is least influential in explaining variation in level of education and most influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status suggests that the disparity in socioeconomic status between males and females is much wider than the educational disparity.

On the whole, the findings of this study have confirmed all the hypotheses included for testing with the exception of the hypothesis regarding age and socioeconomic status and age at arrival and socioeconomic status. The fact that most of these hypotheses are confirmed affirms the importance of including demographic variables in addition to ethnic variables to better account for variation in socioeconomic status. Moreover, the fact that sex emerges as relatively more influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status than ethnic variables, suggests that discrepency in socioeconomic status is relatively stronger along dimensions of sex than ethnicity

6. VARIATION IN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, AN ANALYSIS OF CENSUS METROPOLITAN AREAS

So far, the analyses were done at an individual level for the national sample and for sub-samples of the foreign-born group and six ethnic groups. The intent of this study is also to examine variation in socioeconomic status across CMAs both at the individual and aggregate levels. While the study at the national level provides us with information from a broad framework, it provides very little allowance for examining variation in socioeconomic status at a finer level such as that of urban centres. This is the task of the present chapter.

It was hypothesized earlier in Chapter 2, section 2.5, that socioeconomic status is influenced by the proportion of minority groups in the population and by proportion of the labour force in manufacturing industries. Both of these variables have been included in the analysis. Moreover, it was hypothesized that discrepancy in socioeconomic status increases with size of city. In order to test these hypotheses, CMAs have been treated as sub-samples. As stated earlier in Chapter 3 thirteen such CMAs have been included in this study. The results are presented in four sections. In section one, the results of the zero order correlation matrix are delineated. In section two, the results of the multiple regression analyses are presented. In section three, the results regarding influence of city size on socioeconomic status are provided and in section four a summary and discussion of the results are presented.

6.1 Results of Zero Order Correlation Matrix

For each of the CMAs included in our analyses, the procedure of multiple regression was employed. The zero order correlation, means, proportions, and standard deviations of the variables included for the analyses of the sample, representing the thirteen CMAs, are presented in Tables B-9 to B-21 in Appendix B. With the exception of Montreal (Table B-10), Ottawa (Table B-12), and Quebec (Table B-16) for all other CMAs, the zero order

correlations are .5 or below. In Montreal (Table B-10) there appears multicollinearity between French ethnic origin and use of French language at home (r=.814); and between use of English and French language at home (r=.774). Similarly in Ottawa (Table B-12), multicollinearity is observed between French ethnic origin and French language at home (r=.789); and use of English and French language at home (r=-.888). For Quebec (Table B-16), multicollinearity is observed between use of English and French language at home (r=-.828).

The proportion of ethnic groups for each CMA also varies, with a relatively large proportion of French ethnic origin in Montreal (66.7%), Ottawa 37.5%, and Quebec (93.3%). (Please see Tables B-10, B-12 and B-16). Also, these CMAs are represented by a relatively large proportion of members using the French language at home. For example, 62.6% use French language at home in the Ottawa CMA. The comparable proportion for Montreal and Quebec are 8.9% and 96.6% respectively. All other CMAs, excluding Montreal, Ottawa, and Quebec, are represented by a relatively high proportion of British ethnic origin. The proportion of this group ranges from a high of 68.9% for Halifax(Table B-21) to a low of 35.1% for Winnipeg (Table B-15). Likewise these CMAs also indicate a relatively high proportion of members using English as a home language, with proportions ranging from 93.0% in London (Table B- 18) to 80.4% in Toronto (Table B-9).

The proportion of foreign-born group again varies across the CMAs, ranging from 43.3% in Toronto (Table B-9) to 2.4% in Quebec (Table B-16). Both Toronto and Quebec, however, indicate extreme cases of distribution of the foreign-born group. In most of the other CMAs the proportions of the foreign-born group range from 18.0% in Montreal (Table B-10) to 32.0% in Ottawa (Table B- 12).

The mean age for these CMAs did not indicate much variation, with values ranging from 33.438 for Calgary (Table B-14) to 36.668 for Hamilton (Table B-17).

The proportion of male members also indicated little variation, ranging from 48.4 for London CMA (Table B-18) to 56.7 for Toronto CMA (Table B-9).

Likewise, the distribution of mean family size indicated little variation across the CMAs. For almost half the CMAs the mean family size was close to 3. For example, the mean family size for Toronto CMA (Table B-9) is 3.019, while that for Quebec is 3.041 (Table B-16). For Hamilton CMA it is 3.125 (Table B-17), and for St. Catherines it is 3.213 (Table B-19). For Kitchener it is 3.213 (Table B-20), and for Halifax it is 3.062 (Table B-21). For the rest of the CMAs the mean family size is slightly lower than 3, with Montreal having a mean family size of 2.9333 (Table B-10). In Vancouver (Table B-11), it is 2.835. In Ottawa (Table B-12) and in Edmonton (Table B-13) it is 2.979 and 2.813 respectively. In Calgary (Table B-14) it is 2.746. In Winnipeg (Table B-15) and in London (Table B-18) the mean family sizes are 2.941 and 2.988, respectively. It appears that on the whole, with the exception of Calgary CMA, for all CMAs the mean family size is about 3.

The proportion of members who are mobile indicated a fair amount of variation across the CMAs, with values ranging from a high of 67.4% in Calgary (Table B-14) to a low of 38.7% in Winnipeg (Table B-15).

The proportion of the labour force in maufacturing industries, again, indicated some variation across the CMAs, ranging from 25% in the Hamilton CMA (Table B-17) to 5.2% for Ottawa CMA (Table B-12)

6.2 Multiple Regression Analyses

The multiple regression analyses involved two different models, the details of which appear below.

6.2.1 Model One

In model one all the variables used previously in model two concerning the national sample (Chapter 5 section 5.1) are included. In addition to these variables, the proportion of the labour force in manufacturing industries is also included in this model. Table 6-1

TABLE 6-1 EFFECTS OF SOME ETHNIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF THE THIRTEEN CMAs INCLUDED IN THIS STUDY

Variables	Toronto b	Toronto B	Montreal b	Montreal B	Vancouver b	Vancouver B	Ottawa b	Ottawa B
Ethnic Variables								
Eng Lang	.196	.146*	.161	.130*	.227	.146*	.096	.084
Fren Lang	.346	.055*	---	---	-.322	-.043*	---	--
Ethnic Origin								
British	-.037	-.036**	-.035	-.021	-.050	-.050*	.023	.020
French	-.125	-.041*	-.045	-.041	-.147	-.055*	-.065	-.058**
N.W.Eur	.121	.065*	.126	.049*	-.067	-.045*	.143	.060*
S.E. Eur	-.144	-.112*	-.203	-.119*	-.160	-.092*	-.127	-.055*
Mult Ident	.044	.030*	.033	.015	-.039	-.030	.009	.004
Nativity	-.053	-.025*	.026	.010	.130	.061*	.144	.049*
Demographic Variables								
Age	.013	.164*	.006	.082*	.014	.196*	.019	.223*
Sex	.331	.158*	.258	.124*	.306	.153*	.371	.169*
Mobility	.205	.098*	.112	.054*	.198	.098*	.196	.089*
Family	.042	.054*	-.017	-.022*	-.011	-.015	-.024	-.030**
Manufac	.337	-.138*	-.514	-.213*	-.387	-.139*	-.340	-.077*
Constant	-.149		.258		-.766		-.721	
Multiple R		.368		.330		.322		.353
R^2		.135		.109		.104		.124
Adj R^2		.135		.108		.103		.122
S.E.		.968		.970		.939		1.018
d.f.		13/35333		12/29813		13/14425		12/8024
F		427.045		304.215		129.047		94.909

* Significant at .01 level.
**Significant at .05 level.

TABLE- 6-1 (continued)

Variables	Edmonton b	Edmonton B	Calgary b	Calgary B	Winnipeg b	Winnipeg B
Ethnic Variables						
Home Language						
English	.187	.108*	.212	.110*	.203	.135*
French	.184	.049*	.060	.012	.293	.099*
Ethnic Origin						
British	-.028	-.027	-.050	-.048**	-.024	-.024
French	-.136	-.073*	-.110	-.046**	-.149	-.092*
N.W.Eur	-.060	-.044**	-.038	-.026**	.001	.001
S.E. Eur	-.067	-.050**	-.089	-.050*	-.066	-.054**
Mult Ident	.023	.015	-.027	-.017	.018	.012
Nativity	.102	.041*	.019	.007	.059	.025
Demographic Variables						
Age	.019	.242*	.019	.231*	.008	.126*
Sex	.253	.126*	.369	.369*	.235	.124*
Mobility	.176	.084*	.208	.091*	.120	.063*
Family	-.008	-.012	-.001	-.002	-.032	-.046*
Manufac	-.303	-.093*	-.356	-.100*	-.445	-.178*
Constant	-.836		-1.051		-.069	
Multiple R		.297		.316		.290
R^2		.088		.099		.084
Adj R^2		.087		.098		.084
S.E.		.951		.992		.903
d.f.		13/8015		13/29813		13/7435
F		60.081		63.605		46.325

* Significant at .01 level.
**Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 6-1 (continued)

Variables	Quebec b	Quebec B	Hamilton b	Hamilton B	St. Catherine b	St. Catherine B
Ethnic Variables						
Home Language						
English	.038	.013	.220	.141*	.230	.153*
French	---	---	.175	.033**	.145	.047
Ethnic Origin						
British	.000	-.000	-.045	-.047	-.018	-.021
French	-.070	-.034	-.129	-.054	-.114	-.070**
N.W.Eur	-.264	-.037**	.012	.004	-.012	-.008
S.E. Eur	-.052	-.007	.110	-.090*	-.068	-.062
Mult Ident	-.028	-.006	.070	.037	.136	.068**
Nativity	.224	.035**	.029	.013	.122	.058**
Demographic Variables						
Age	.006	.074*	.011	.160*	.010	.157*
Sex	.273	.134*	.309	.161*	.268	.149*
Mobility	.223	.110*	.164	.086*	.095	.053*
Family	.000	-.000	-.016	-.022	-.008	-.001
Manufac	-.591	-.183*	-.274	-.133*	-.250	-.129*
Constant	.121		-.629		-.679	
Multiple R		.255		.304		.286
R^2		.065		.092		.082
Adj R^2		.063		.090		.078
S.E.		.975		.906		.850
d.f.		12/5739		13/5939		13/3117
F		36.362		46.459		21.467

* Significant at .01 level.
**Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 6-1 (continued)

Variables	London b	London B	Kitchener b	Kitchener B	Halifax b	Halifax B
Ethnic Variables						
Home Language						
English	.238	.120*	.261	.166*	.265	.068**
French	-.025	-.003	.342	.055**	.152	.053
Ethnic Origin						
British	-.034	-.034	-.053	-.054	-.058	-.055
French	-.059	-.024	-.163	-.067*	-.155	-.094*
N.W.Eur	-.020	-.012	-.101	-.087**	.004	.004
S.E. Eur	-.064	-.040	-.119	-.081**	-.112	-.022
Mult Ident	.043	.020	-.005	-.002	-.070	-.023
Nativity	-.001	-.000*	.123	.055**	.447	.139*
Demographic Variables						
Age	.011	.157*	.011	.150*	.012	.167*
Sex	.280	.142*	.341	.175*	.146	.076*
Mobility	.128	.065*	.153	.079*	.294	.151*
Family	-.030	-.041**	-.019	-.027	-.013	-.018
Manufac	-.366	-.148*	-.416	-.205*	-.241	-.066*
Constant	-.662		-.662		-1.059	
Multiple R		.288		.339		.278
R^2		.083		.115		.077
Adj R^2		.079		.111		.073
S.E.		.940		.910		.925
d.f.		13/3197		13/3209		13/3029
F		22.305		32.211		19.551

* Significant at .01 level.
**Significant at .05 level.

illustrates the results of multiple regression analyses. In order to find a convenient way of making comparisons across the CMAs, only the standardized and unstandardized coefficients are provided in a single Table.

The adjusted R^2 for the analyses of each CMA indicated some variation with a range as high as .135 for Toronto CMA and as low as .068 for Quebec CMA.

The beta coefficients for the independent variables also indicate some variation in socioeconomic status. But the set of independent variables employed in this model can be broadly categorized into ethnic variables and demographic variables. Under ethnic variables, ethnic origin, home language and nativity are included. Under demographic variables, age, sex, mobility, family size and the proportion of labour force in manufacturing industries are included. Even though the proportion of labour force in manufacturing industries is not truly representative as a demographic variable, it is so categorized in order to present the results more efficiently. Overall, the demographic variables appear to have a relatively stronger influence on socioeconomic status than do the ethnic variables. Detailed information regarding the regression coefficients is provided below.

6.2.1.1 Ethnic Variables

Under ethnic variables, use of home language, ethnic origin and nativity are included.

Home Language:

Home language is represented by two variables, .i.e use of English and French as home languages. Use of English as a home language has a much stronger influence on socioeconomic status than use of French language at home. In fact, use of English as a home language is on the whole, a more influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status than ethnic origin and nativity. Multicollinearity between use of English and French as home languages was observed for Montreal, Ottawa, and Quebec CMAs.(See Tables B-10, B-12, and B-16). In order to overcome this problem, multiple regression analyses were employed in two stages for each of these CMAs. In the first

stage, use of French as home language was excluded and in the second stage, use of English as home language was excluded. For the two CMAs of Montreal and Ottawa, use of English as a home language appeared to be more influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status than use of French as a home language. The adjusted R^2 for each of these CMAs also appeared to be relativley higher in the analyses where use of French as a home language was excluded. So, for these two CMAs, i.e Montreal and Ottawa, use of English rather than French as a home language was included.

For the Quebec CMA, the multiple regression analyses carried out indicated that neither the use of English, nor the use of French as home language are statistically significant. However, the beta coefficients representing use of English as home language, appeared to be relatively higher (.013) than use of French as home language (*B*.000, not provided in this study). The adjusted R^2 .063) was slightly higher when use of English as home language was included than when use of French language was included (adjusted R^2 not provided in this study). So the analyses which included use of English as a home language are reported for Quebec CMA in Table 20.

For the rest of the CMAs, the association between use of English as a home language and socioeconomic status is positive. In other words, the socioeconomic status rises with an increase in the proportion of members who use English as home language.

Use of French as a home language also indicates a positive association with socioeconomic status. But the beta coefficients representing French as the home language are much weaker than those representing English as home language. This means that with an increase in the proportion of members who use French at home, the rise in socioeconomic status is not as sharp as in the case of those who use English as a home language. Moreover, the negative intercept for all CMAs except Montreal, and Quebec, indicates that the socioeconomic status declines with a increase in the proportion of members whose home language neither English nor French. This lends support to our earlier assumption that members using English or French as home languages are expected to have higher socioeconomic status than those whose home language is neither English

nor French.

The beta coefficients representing English as home language are strongest for Kitchener (*B*.166) and St. Catherine (*B*.153). In fact, for these CMAs, this variable is the second most influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. In comparison, for Winnipeg (*B*.135) and Montreal (*B*.130), use of English as a home language ranks second in order of importance. For Toronto (*B*.146) and Vancouver(*B*.146) use of English as a home language ranks third in importance in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. The beta coefficients representing use of English as a home language for Edmonton, Calgary, and Ottawa CMAs are (*B*.108, .110 and .089) respectively. Even though these beta coefficients are much lower than those reported for Toronto and Vancouver, the former (beta coefficients representing Edmonton, Calgary, and Ottawa) appear to have a fairly strong influence on socioeconomic status, ranking third in order of importance. The CMA of London indicates a beta coefficient of .120 for this variable which ranks fourth in order of importance in influencing variation in socioeconomic status.

In Halifax, use of English as a home language, compared to the rest of the variables, has been found to have a relatively weak influence on socieconomic status (*B*.068).

Use of French as a home language has a relatively low beta coefficient compared to all other independent variables in the analyses of Halifax CMA. This variable appears to have a relatively strong influence in accounting for the variation in socioeconomic status of Winnipeg CMA (*B*.099). In fact this variable ranks fourth in order of importance in influencing the socioeconomic status within the Winnipeg CMA. For most of the other CMAs, use of French as a home language indicates a positive association with socioeconomic status. However, compared to the coefficients representing use of English as a home language, the coefficients representing use of French as a home language are relatively weak.

Ethnic Origin:

Ethnic origin is represented by five variables as shown in Table 20. Overall, the beta coefficients representing ethnic origin have a relatively weaker influence on socioeconomic status than the beta coefficients representing use of English language at home. There are however, considerable variations in the beta coefficients for the variables representing ethnic origin. The beta coefficients for each of the variables representing ethnic origin are discussed in detail below.

British Ethnic Origin:

For most of the CMAs, the beta coefficients representing members of the British ethnic group are statistically insignificant. The only exceptions where the beta coefficients are statistically significant are the CMAs of Toronto (*B*-.036), Vancouver (*B*-.050), and Calgary (*B*-.048). In these three CMAs the association between members representing the British ethnic group and socioeconomic status is negative. This means that compared to the members of the Non-European ehtnic group, an increase in the proportion of members of the British ethnic group is associated with a decline in socioeconomic status.

French Ethnic Origin:

In contrast to the above beta coefficient, the beta coefficients representing members of the French ethnic origin are statistically significant for most of the CMAs. The only exceptions where the beta coefficients of this variable are statistically not significant include Montreal (*B*-.041), Hamilton (*B*-.054), and London (*B*-.024).

The beta coefficients representing members of the French ethnic group are negative indicating a decline in socioeconomic status with an increase in the proportion of members of French ethnic group. This is true for the CMAs of Ottawa (*B*-.058), Edmonton (*B*-.073), Winnipeg (*B*-.092), St. Catherines (*B*-.070) and Halifax (*B*-.094). For these CMAs, the (negative) influence of this variable i.e. members of the French ethnic origin on socioeconomic status is much stronger than for all other ethnic variables.

Thus, in these CMAs, an increase in the proportion of the French ethnic group leads to a decline in socioeconomic status which is sharper than the decline associated with members of other ethnic groups.

South East European Ethnic Origin:

South East European ethnic origin is negatively associated with socioeconomic status. This negative association is strongest in the CMAs of Toronto (*B*-.112), Vancouver (*B*-.092), Calgary (*B*-.050), Hamilton (*B*-.090) and Kitchener (*B*-.081) In Ottawa (*B*-.055), Edmonton (*B*-.050), Winnipeg (*B*-.054), the influence of this variable on socioeconomic status is not as strong as the influence of French ethnicity on socioeconomic status. In the CMA of Quebec (*B*-.007), St. Catherines (*B*-.062) London (*B*-.040) and Halifax (*B*-.022) the beta coefficients are statistically not significant.

North West European Ethnic Origin:

The beta coefficients for this ethnic category are statistically insignificant for almost half the CMAs i.e. Calgary (*B*.026), Winnipeg (*B*.001), Hamilton (*B*.004), St. Catherines (*B*-.008), London (*B*-.012) and Halifax (*B*-.004). The association of this variable with socioeconomic status is positive for only three CMAs, namely Toronto (*B*.065), Montreal (*B*.049), and Ottawa (*B*.060). In fact, the North West European ethnic group is the only ethnic group that indicated a positive association with socioeconomic status. Even then, this positive association is only confined to the CMAs of Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa.

This positive association could perhaps be accounted for at least in part, by the fact that in these three CMAs, the North West European group is represented by a relatively large proportion of members of Jewish origin. In fact, Ray (1975:239) notes that Montreal attracted nearly half the Jewish immigrants. The same may be true, albeit to a lesser degree, of Toronto and Otawa.

For all other CMAs the association between North West European ethnic group and socioeconomic status is negative. This negative association is strongest in Kitchener (*B*.087), Vancouver (*B*-.045), followed by Edmonton (*B*-.044) and Quebec (*B*-.037). In St. Catherine (*B*-.008) and London (*B*-.012) the beta coefficients are statistically not significant. In Edmonton, the influence of this variable (*B*-.044) on socioeconomic status is not as strong as the influence of French ethnic origin(B-.073) In Vancouver, the influence of this variable on socioeconomic status is not as strong (-.045) compared to the variable representing members of the French ethnic origin (B-.055), and the British ethnic origin (*B*-.050). For the rest of the CMAs where this variable has a negative association, the beta coefficients are relatively low (compared to the beta coefficients representing members of South East European and French ethnic origin). The fact that Kitchener indicates a strong negative association between members of North West European ethnic origin compared to members of other ethnic groups, is surprising and it may perhaps be attributed to the relatively large concentration of Mennonites (who have probably been included with members of North West European ethnic group).

Multiple Ethnic Origin:

There is a weak association between multiple ethnic identity and socioeconomic status. Out of the thirteen CMAs, only two indicated statistically significant relationships. For the CMAs of Toronto (B.030) and St. Catherines (*B*.068), the beta coefficients are statistically significant but not so for the the rest of the CMAs, i.e. Vancouver (*B*-.030), Ottawa (B.004), Edmonton (B.015), Calgary (B-.017), Winnipeg (B .012), Quebec (B-.006), Hamilton (B.037), London (*B*.020), and Kitchener (*B*-.002).

Nativity:

The influence of nativity on socioeconomic status appeared to be relatively weak for most of the CMAs, compared to the overall effect of the other variables in the model. With the exception of Toronto (*B*-.025) and London (*B*-.000) CMAs, the

influence of nativity on socioeconomic status is postive for all other CMAs. This means that with an increase in the proportion of the members in the foreign-born ethnic group, the socioeconomic status rises. This positive influence is strongest in Halifax (*B*.139) where the beta coefficient of nativity ranks third in order of importance in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status. For the rest of the CMAs the influence of this variable on socioeconomic status is relatively weak. In Montreal (*B*.010), Calgary (*B*.007), Winnipeg (*B*.025) and in Hamilton (*B*.013) the beta coefficient of this variable is statisticaliy not significant.

This variation regarding the relationship between nativity and socioeconomic status is interesting. We observed that on the one hand the CMAs of Toronto and London indicated a negative association with socioeconomic status and on the other hand the CMA of Halifax indicated a relatively strong positive association with socioeconomic status. For the CMAs of Toronto and London this negative association could perhaps be accounted for by the presence of a high proportion of members of South East European ethnic origin. For example in Toronto about 21.1% of the members of ethnic group are of South East European origin and in London this group comprises about 20.0% of the population (see Tables B-9 and B-18 in Appendix B). These proportions are much higher than the national average of 8.0% (see Table B-1 in Appendix B). It is quite likely that a relatively large proprotion of these members of South East European ethnic origin are foreign-born. In addition, earlier studies indicate that they tend to occupy a relatively low socioeconomic status (Porter 1965, Li 1978).

6.2.1.2 Demographic Variables

Among the demographic and ecological variables, age appears to be the most influential and family size the least influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status for most of the CMAs.

Age:

Age is an influential variable in more than half the CMAs including Toronto (*B*.164), Vancouver (*B*.196), Ottawa (*B*.223), Edmonton (*B*.242), St. Catherines (*B*.157), and Halifax (*B*.167). For these CMAs, variation in socioeconomic status is to a large extent explained by variation across age-cohorts. The positive association between age and socioeconomic status indicates that the older the age-cohort, the higher the socioeconomic status. For the remaining five CMAs, the influence of age on socioeconomic status is fairly strong, ranking second or third in order of importance in explaining variation in socioeconomic status.

Sex:

The influence of sex on socioeconomic status also appears to be strong on the whole, though not as strong as the influence of age on socioeconomic status. Out of the thirteen CMAs, only in two CMAs i.e Calgary (*B*.369) and Hamilton (*B*.161) does sex emerge as the most influential variable in explaining socioeconomic status. For Toronto (*B*.158), Vancouver (*B*.158), Ottawa (*B*.169), Edmonton (*B*.126), and Kitchener (*B*.175), sex ranks as the second most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. In St.Catherines (*B*.149), London (*B*.142), and Montreal (*B*.124) it ranks as the third most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status, whereas in Winnipeg (*B*.124) and Quebec (*B*.134) it ranks as the fourth most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. In the Halifax CMA, the influence of sex in explaining variation in socioeconomic status is much weaker(*B*.076) than the rest variables included for analyses of that CMA

Mobility:

Mobility, or proportion of members who are mobile, on the whole, is relatively less influential (compared to other variables included in the analyses) in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. The influence of this variable is the strongest in Halifax (*B*.151). Halifax is the only CMA where the influence of this variable is

relatively stronger than most of the other variables. Compared to most of the other CMAs, Halifax indicated a relatively strong positive relationship between mobility status and socioeconomic status. It was also observed that Halifax was the only CMA that indicated a strong positive relation between nativity and socioeconomic status, meaning that with an increase in proportion of members representing the foreign-born group there is a concomitant rise in socioeconomic status. These results lead us to speculate that these members of the foreign-born group with high socioeocnomic status are also the ones who are relatively more mobile.

In the remaining CMAs, the influence of mobility on socioeconomic status is not as strong. In Ottawa mobility is the third most important in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. For the remaining CMAs, the influence of this variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status is relatively weak. For example, in Montreal (*B*.054) it is the fourth most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. In Edmonton (*B*.084), Calgary (*B*.091), Quebec (*B*.110), London (*B*.065), it ranks as the fifth most influential variable in accounting for the variation in socioeconomic status. Its influence in explaining variation in socioeconomic status is relatively weak for Toronto (*B*.098), Vancouver (*B*.089), Winnipeg (*B*.063) and Hamilton (*B*.086), where it ranks as the sixth most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. The influence of mobility status in explaining variation in socioeconomic status is even much weaker for Kitchener (*B*.079) and St. Catherines (*B*.053) where it ranks as the seventh and tenth most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status.

Family Size:

On the whole, family size is the least influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. For all the CMAs the association between family size and socioeconomic status is negative, indicating that with an increase in size of families the socioeconomic status declines. Among all the CMAs the strongest influence of family size

on socioeconomic status is for London CMA ranking as the sixth most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. For the rest of the CMAs, family size ranks as the eighth or even lower, in explaining variation in socioeconomic status.

Proportion of Labour Force in Manufacturing:

Proportion of labour force in manufacturing appears to have a relatively strong influence on socioeconomic status. The association between this variable and socioeconomic status is negative, which indicates that with an increase in the proportion of labour force in manufacturing, the socioeconomic status declines. This negative association is understandable because the variable reflects a heavy concentration of labour force in manual occupations.

The influence of this variable is strongest in Montreal (*B*-.213), Winnipeg (*B*-.178) and Kitchener (*B*-.205) where it is the most important variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. There may be a number of factors attributed to this strong negative relationship. But given the lack of sufficient data, we can only speculate on this finding. It is quite possible that the ethnic composition of these CMAs is a relevant factor. For example, in Montreal CMA, a strong negative association is found between members of South East European ethnic origin (*B*.119) and socieocnomic status. Winnipeg indicated a strong negative relationship between members of the French ethnic group (*B*-.092) and socioeconomic status. The CMA of Kitchener also indicated a negative association between members of North West European ethnic group and socioeoconimic status (*B*-.087) as well as a negative association between members of South East European ethnic group and socioeconomic status (*B*-.081). Earlier literature has indicated that the members of French ethnic origin and South East European ethnic origin are in a relatively lower socioeconomic status. The works of Li (1978), and Porter (1965) are examples in this context. Therefore in these CMAs, the negative association between proportion of labour force and socioeconomic status could be because of the presence of these ethnic groups that are mostly concentrated in manufacturing jobs.

For the CMAs of Quebec (B-.183) and London (B-.148), this variable is the second most influential in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status. For Toronto (B-.138), Vancouver (B -.139), Ottawa (B-.077) and St. Catherines (B-.129) it is the fourth most influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. It is least influential in Halifax (B-.066) where it ranks as the sixth most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status.

6.2.2 Model Two

In model two the proportion of minority groups has been included as an additional variable to examine its effect on socioeconomic status, controlling for all other variables in the model. In this model, however, variables representing ethnic origin have been excluded because of high multicollinearity between them and the proportion of minority groups.

The adjusted R^2 for each CMA indicates some variation, with Ottawa and Toronto having the highest adjusted R^2 (.115 for each of these CMAs) and St. Catherines having the lowest adjusted R^2(.070). (See Table 6-2)

TABLE 6-2 EFFECTS OF SOME ETHNIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECOLOGICAL VARIABLES ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF THE THIRTEEN CMAs INCLUDED IN THIS STUDY

Variables	Toronto b	Toronto B	Montreal b	Montreal B	Vancouver b	Vancouver B
Ethnic Variables						
Home Language						
English	.252	.188*	.211	.169*	.211	.136*
French	.328	.052*			.260	.035*
Nativity	-.032	-.015	-.001	.000	.144	.068*
Minority	.016	.015	-.028	-.025	-.044	-.044
Demographic Variables						
Age	.013	.167*	.006	.084*	.014	.191*
Sex	.327	.156*	.258	.124*	.305	.152*
Mobility Status	.223	.107*	.123	.059*	.203	.100*
Family Size	-.046	-.060*	-.021	-.027*	-.009	-.012
Manufacturing	-.343	-.140*	-.526	-.218*	-.389	-.139*
Constant	-.166		.341		-.489	
Multiple R		.339		.307		.315
R^2		.115		.094		.099
Adj R^2		.115		.094		.098
S.E.		.980		.978		.942
d.f.		9/35337		8/29817		9/14429
F		512.708		389.456		176.945

* Significant at .01 level.
**Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 6-2 (Continued)

Variables	Ottawa b	Ottawa B	Edmonton b	Edmonton B	Calgary b	Calgary B	Winnipeg b	Winnipeg B
Ethnic Variables								
Home Lang								
English	.141	.123*	.161	.093*	.206	.107**	.202	.134*
French	---	---	.096	.025	.017	.003	.196.	.066
Nativity	.178	.060*	.138	.056*	.032	.012	.101	.043
Minority	-.036	-.033	-.034	-.035**	-.013	-.013	-.020	-.021
Demographic Variables								
Age	.019	.224*	.018	.238*	.019	.228*	.008	.122*
Sex	.368	.168*	.252	.125*	.368	.175*	.236	.125*
Mobility	.199	.090*	.180	.086*	.206	.091*	.122	.064*
Family	-.024	-.029	-.007	-.010	-.001	-.001	-.035	-.048**
Manufac	-.345	-.078*	-.303	-.093*	-.358	-.101*	-.445	-.177*
Constant	-.780		-.749		-.871		-.047	
Multiple R	.340		.290		.312		.277	
R^2	.116		.084		.097		.077	
Adj R^2	.115		.083		.096		.075	
S.E.	1.023		.953		.993		.907	
d.f.	8/8028		9/8019		9/7457		9/6523	
F	131.905		81.886		89.845		60.495	

* Significant at .01 level.
**Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 6-2 (Continued)

Variables	Quebec b	Quebec B	Hamilton b	Hamilton B	St. Catherines b	St. Catherines B
Ethnic Origin						
Home Language						
English			.249	.160*	.236	.157*
French	.020	.007	.140	.026**	.087	.028
Nativity	.270	.042**	.026	.012	.144	.069*
Minority	-.063	-.025	-.008	-.021	-.024	
Demographic Variables						
Age	.006	.075*	.010	.158	.010	.156*
Sex	.273	.134*	.310	.162*	.276	.153*
Mobility Status	.225	.111*	.168	.088*	.099	.055**
Family Size	.000	.000	-.016	-.022	-.007	-.011
Manufacturing	-.589	-.183*	-.283	-.138*	-.263	-.136*
Constant	-.101		-.588		-.745	
Multiple R		.250		.287		.266
R^2		.062		.082		.070
Adj R^2		.061		.081		.068
S.E.		.975		.910		.854
d.f.		8/5742		9/5913		9/3121
F		48.228		59.346		26.461

* Significant at .01 level.
**Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 6-2 (Continued)

Variables	London b	London B	Kitchener b	Kitchener B	Halifax b	Halifax B
Ethnic Variables:						
Home Language						
English	.259	.131*	.256	.163*	.137	.048
French	-.032	-.004	.280	.045	.183	.047
Nativity	.011	.004	.137	.062*	.499	.145*
Minority	.018	.017	-.052	-.053*	-.025	-.021
Demographic Variables						
Age	.011	.157*	.010	.144*	.012	.165*
Sex	.279	.142*	.341	.175*	.144	.074**
Mobility Status	.127	.064**	.149	.077**	.292	.151*
Family Size	-.031	-.042**	-.020	-.028	-.012	-.018
Manufacturing	-.365	-.147*	-.420	-.207*	-.236	-.065**
Minority .018	.017	-.052	-.053**	-.026	-.022	
Constant	-.440		-.407		-.934	
Multiple R		.283		.333		.268
R^2		.080		.111		.071
Adj R^2		.077		.108		.069
S.E.		.941		.912		.927
d.f.		9/3201		9/3213		9/3033
F		31.000		44.638		26.1199

* Significant at .01 level.
**Significant at .05 level.

The distribution of beta coefficients is almost identical to that of model one, with age and sex as relatively more influential in explaining variation in socioeocnomic status than the rest of the variables included in this model. A detailed description of the beta coefficients for the ethnic and demographic variables follows in the next section of this chapter.

6.2.2.1 Ethnic Variables

Home Language:

As in model one, home language is represented by two variables i.e. use of English as a home language and use of French as a home language. Both variables show a positve association with socioeconomic status. This indicates that with an increase in the proportion of members who use English as their home language and also with an increase in the proportion of members who use French as their home language, the socioeconomic status rises. However, the beta coefficients representing use of English as a home language are much higher than the beta coefficients representing use of French as a home language. This means that with an increase in the proportion of members who use English as home language, the socioeconomic status rises more than with a similar increase in the proportion of members who use French as a home language.

The beta coefficients representing use of English as a home language appear to be the strongest for Toronto (.188), Hamilton (.160) and St. Catherines (.157) ranking as the most important variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. The fact that use of English as a home language has a much stronger influence on socioeconomic status for the CMAs of Toronto, Hamilton and St. Catherines than the rest of the CMAs is interesting to note. It is apparent from our data (See Table B-9 in Appendix B) that Toronto CMA has the highest proportion of members representing the foreign-born group (43.3%) compared to 16.0% of members representing the national sample (see Table B-1 in Appendix B). It may be speculated that most of these members of foreign-born group are more likely to speak a language other than English at home. Further, they are less likely to be proficient in the English language and therefore less

competent in the labour market in comparison with their native-born counterparts.

Aside from Toronto, the CMAs of Hamilton and St. Catherine indicated a strong positive relationship between use of English as home language and socioeconomic status. It is not clear why this is the case. Inasmuch as Toronto CMA has a relatively high proportion of members of the foreign-born group, Hamilton and St. Catherine have a relatively high proportion of members of British ethnic origin. (See Tables B-17 and B 19 in Appendix B). For most of these members of British ethnic origin, English is their home language. This fact may explain the strong positive association between use of English as home language and socioeconomic status.

For the remaining CMAs, the influence of English as home language on socieoconomic status is not so strong. It is the second most important variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status for the CMAs of Montreal (*B*.169) and Winnipeg (*B*134). It is the third most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status for Vancouver (*B*.136), Ottawa (*B*.123), Edmonton (*B* .093) and Kitchener (*B*.163). For London this variable is the fourth most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status (B.131) and for Halifax CMA it is statistically not significant.

The impact of French as a home language, on the whole, is not as strong as use of English as a home language. For Winnipeg it is the fifth most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status (B.196). For all other CMAs it ranks as the sixth most influential variable, or even lower, in explaining variation in socioeconomic status.

Nativity:

The influence of nativity on socioeconomic status, on the whole, is relatively weaker than the influence of use of English as a home language. However, the influence of nativity on socioeconomic status is relatively stronger in this model than in model one. This means that the influence of nativity on socioeconomic status diminishes when the

effects of ethnic origin are controlled for. The influence of nativity in explaining variation in socioeconomic status is strongest in Halifax(*B*.145) where it is the third most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. For the CMAs of St. Catherines (B.069), Vancouver (B.068) and Edmonton (B.056), it is the fifth most important variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. For all other CMAs its influence in explaining variation in socioeconomic status is relatively weak, ranking as the sixth, or even lower, in order of importance.

Proportion of Minority Groups:

This variable is represented by combining the proportions of ethnic groups who are not of British origin. But there has been some deviation from this measurement, specifically for the three CMAs of Montreal, Ottawa and Quebec. Each of these CMAs has a relatively large proportion of members of French ethnic origin, compared to the rest of the CMAs. For example, in Montreal the proportion of members representing French ethnic origin is 66.7%; in Quebec, it is 93.3% and in Ottawa , it is 37.5%. Moreover these CMAs have relatively large proportions of members who use French as home language. For example, in Montreal CMA the proportion of members who use French as a home language is 68.9%; for Ottawa, it is 62.6%; and for Quebec, it is 96.6%. The high concentration of the French ethnic group in these specific geographic locations along with the concentration of a relatively large proportion of members who use French as home language, would raise some ambiguity if members of the French ethnic group (in these CMAs) were to be represented in the proportion of minority groups.

As an exploratory step, three indpendent analyses were carried out. The details of these analyses have been presented in chapter III. The differences in the results of these three analyses were negligible. In each case, the influence of proportion of minority groups on socioeconomic status was found to be statistically insignificant.

With reference to the CMAs, the influence of relative size of minority groups on socioeconomic status is weak in absolute terms particularly in comparison to the influence

of the other variables included in the model. The association is statistically significant in only three CMAs, i.e Kitchener (*B* -.053), Vancouver (*B*-.044), and Edmonton (*B*-.035); and it is also negative, indicating that with an increase in the proportion of members representing the minority groups, there is a decline in socioeconomic status. Given these results, we are not in a position to confirm the relevant hypothesis.

6.2.2.2 Demographic Variables

Age:

Age appears to be more influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status than any of the other variables. Its influence in explaining variation in socioeconomic status is the strongest in Vancouver (*B*.191), Edmonton (*B*.238), Calgary (*B*.228), London (*B*.157) and Halifax (*B*.165), where it is the most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status.

In Toronto (*B*.167), Ottawa (*B*.168), and St. Catherines (*B*.156) this variable is the second most influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status, whereas in Hamilton (*B*.158) it is the third most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. In Montreal (*B*.084), Winnipeg (*B*.122) and in Kitchener (*B*.144), the influence of age is not as strong as in the other CMAs, ranking fourth in order of importance in explaining variation in socioeconomic status.

Sex:

The influence of sex on socioeconomic status on the whole appears to be strong for most of the CMAs. In Hamilton (*B*.162) and Kitchener (*B*.175), sex is the most influential variable in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status. In Vancouver (*B*.152), Ottawa (*B*.168), Edmonton (*B*.125), Calgary (*B*.175) London (*B*.142) and Quebec (*B*.134), this variable is the second most influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. In Toronto (*B*.156), Montreal (*B*.124), Winnipeg (*B*.125), and St. Catherines (*B*.153), it is the third most important variable in explaining variation in

socioeconomic status. The influence of sex on socioeconomic status is weakest in Halifax CMA (*B*.074) where it ranks fourth in order of importance in explaining variation in socioeconomic status.

Mobility Status:

The influence of mobility status on socioeconomic status is strongest in the Halifax CMA (*B*.151) where it is the second most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. For Ottawa (*B*.090) and Edmonton (*B*.086), it is the fourth most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. For the rest of the CMAs i.e Toronto (*B*.107), Montreal (*B*.059), Vancouver (*B*.100), Winnipeg (*B*.064), Hamilton (*B*.088), St.Catherines (*B*.055), London (*B*.064), and Kitchener (*B*.077), the influence of this variable on socioeconomic status is relatively weak, ranking either fifth or sixth in order of importance. The positive association between this variable and socioeconomic status indicates that with an increase in the proportion of members who are mobile, there is a concomitant rise in socioeconomic status. This confirms our hypothesis regarding these two variables.

Family Size:

The influence of family size on socioeconomic status is relatively weak on the whole. The negative association between the two variables indicates that with an increase in family size, socioeconomic status declines. For most CMAs it ranks as the sixth most influential variable, or lower, in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status.

Proportion of Labour Force in Manufacturing:

The proportion of the labour force in manufacturing industries appears to be a relatively more influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status compared to other variables such as as nativity, family size and mobility status.

For the CMAs of Montreal (*B*-.218), Winnipeg (*B*-.177), Quebec (*B*-.183) and Kitchener (*B*-.207) it is the most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. For the CMA of London (*B*-.147), it is the second most important variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. For the CMA of Vancouver (*B*-.139) and Edmonton (*B*-.093) it is the third most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. In Toronto (*B* -.140), Calgary (*B*-.101), Hamilton (*B*-.138), and St. Catherines (*B*-.136) it is the fourth most important variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. In Ottawa (*B*-.078) and Halifax (*B*-.065) the influence of this variable is the weakest, ranking fifth in order of importance. These results confirm our earlier hypothesis that variation in socioeconomic status is explained by variation in the proportion of labour force in manufacturing. In congruence to our earlier findings in model one, the association between this variable and socioeconomic status is negative, indicating that with an increase in the proportion of labour force in manufacturing, socioeconomic status declines. This is a reflection of concentration of blue collar workers in the manufacturing industries.

City Size:

The hypothesis under examination is that disparity in socioeconomic status of ethnic groups is likely to increase with size of cities. In order to test this hypothesis, the thirteen CMAs included in this study have been ranked according to their size and the mean socioeconomic status as well. Standard deviations were employed as an indicator of examinig disparity in socioeconomic status of ethnic groups and nativity.

It should also be noted that for this specific analysis, socioeconomic status was computed by identifying three categories of occupation on the basis of the Pineo, Porter and McRoberts' scoring procedure (1976) and cross tabulating these categories with education and income. On the basis of a cross-tabular analysis, the categories of occupation income and education were combined into a composite index. This new index had to be adapted for comparability with the variable used earlier to represent

socioeconomic status (which was standardized with a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one).

The mean socioeconomic status and the standard deviations for each of these CMAs are presented in Table 6-3. As stated earlier, the standard deviation is being employed as an indicator of examining disparity in socioeconomic status. The higher the standard deviation, the greater the discrepency in socioeconomic status.

Contrary to our hypothesis, the results indicate very little evidence of any linear relationship between city size and socioeconomic disparity. Toronto, which is the largest metropolis, does not have the highest standard deviation as expected. In fact, Quebec, which is the eight largest city, has the highest standard deviation (2.301). Some of the relatively larger CMAs such as Montreal (sd 2.219), Vancouver (sd 2.005) and Ottawa (sd 2.145) do have higher standard deviations. However, the standard deviations for some of the relatively smaller cities such as St. Catherines (sd 2.122) and Halifax (2.107) are higher than the standard deviations for some of the relatively larger metropolises such as Edmonton (sd 1.880), Calgary (sd 1.827) and Winnipeg (sd 1.993).

6.3 Summary and Discussion

The summary and discussion are organized in two sections. In section one, an attempt will be made to summarize the main features of the two models which we have employed in this study. In section two, an attempt will be made to summarize the results concerning the Census Metropolitan Areas.

6.3.1 A Summary and Discussion of the Two Models

The results indicate some common patterns between model one and model two. Both models indicate that on the whole, the demographic variables are more influential in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status, than the ethnic variables. For both models,

TABLE-6-3 MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS ACROS CMAs

	Ethnic Groups		Nativity	
C.M.A.	x	sd	x	sd
Toronto	6.525	1.991	6.525	1.991
Montreal	6.145	2.219	6.321	2.153
Vancouver	6.520	2.005	6.576	2.009
Ottawa	6.463	2.145	6.657	2.125
Edmonton	6.683	1.880	6.666	1.999
Calgary	6.770	1.827	6.647	1.967
Winnipeg	6.372	1.993	6.393	2.002
Quebec	6.100	2.301	6.556	2.173
Hamilton	6.225	2.095	6.258	2.131
St. Catherines	5.972	2.122	6.129	2.158
London	6.417	1.998	6.412	1.988
Kitchener	6.362	1.976	6.368	1.974
Halifax	6.324	2.107	6.930	2.041

use of English as home language appears to be the most influential ethnic variable in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status. Among the demographic variables, age appears to be the most influential variable and family size the least influential variable in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status. Proportion of labour force in manufacturing industries also appeared to be a fairly influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status, for both models. The fact that in both models, age and sex emerged as the most influential variables in explaining variation in socioeconomic status, allows us to conclude that there is some merit in including demographic variables for explaining variation in socioeconomic status. Earlier studies on age and gender inequality have pointed out the prevalence of inequality along these two dimensions. On considering these variables simultaneously with ethnicity, the existence of inequality in terms of age and sex has been reaffirmed. Thus, we can infer that in comparison with ethnic inequality, inequality along the dimensions of age and sex are more critical feature in the Canadian context.

Aside from these commonalities in the two models, some differences were also observed. The major difference was the inclusion of ethnic origin as a variable representing ethnicity in model one and its exclusion from model two. In model two, proportion of members representing minority status has been included instead. The results regarding these two variables are summarized below.

In model one, five variables representing ethnic origin have been included, which on the whole indicate relatively weak influence on socioeconomic status. Out of these variables, two, namely, proportion of members representing the British ethnic group and those with multiple ethnic identity are statistically insignificant for most of the CMAs. A third variable representing ethnic origin, i.e members of North West European ethnic group is statistically insignificant for almost half the CMAs. The two variables that are statistically significant for all the CMAs i.e South East European ethnic origin and French ethnic origin indicate a negative association with socioeconomic status.

Likewise, nativity appears to have a relatively weak influence on socioeconomic status, compared to use of English as a home language. The fact that both nativity and ethnic origin

have a relatively weak influence on socioeconomic status, compared to use of English as a home language may in fact suggest that ascriptive factors such as ancestral lineage or place of birth are relatively less influential in determining one's socioeconomic status than more adaptive indicators such as use of English as home language. In other words, to the extent one readily adapts or conforms to the language of the host society, there is a greater likelihood of a relatively higher socioeconomic status for individuals, controlling for one's ethnic origin and place of birth. These results are not conclusive because of methodological limitations encountered in the study. For example, ethnic origin as defined in the 1981 Census of Canada pertains to a dilemma between current ethnic affiliation and that of ancestral ethnic affiliation. Questions pertaining to current ethnic affiliation exclusively, might indicate results different from the present ones.

In contrast to model one, in model two minority group has been introduced for examining variation in socieoconomic status and was found to be statistically insignificant for most of the CMAs. It should be noted here that minority group was introduced with the underlying assumption that the British are the dominant group and all other groups are subordinate group. Judging from this study, there was little discrepancy in the socioeconomic status between the British ethnic group and the remaining four ethnic groups. None of the CMAs indicate a strong positive relationship between British ethnic origin and socioeconomic status. Moreover, the ethnic groups who represent the minority group as well, indicate much variation regarding their associaiton with socioeconomic status. For example, in Toronto CMA, there is a strong negative association between ethnic origin and socioeconomic status. In contrast, North West European ethnic origin indicates a positive relationship with socioeconomic status. (See Table 6-1). On the contrary, in Edmonton CMA the members representing French ethnic origin indicated a strong negative relationship with socioeconomic status compared to the members of the remaining ethnic origins. It seems that the concept of minority group carries a geographic connotation, indicating variation from one urban centre to another.

6.3.2 A Summary and Discussion of Results Regarding CMAs

On the whole, the results regarding the CMAs indicate some commonalities. For example, Toronto, Vancouver and Ottawa reflect some similarities in terms of pattern of variation in socioeconomic status. For each of these CMAs, the variables influencing socioeconomic status in order of importance are age, sex, use of English as a home language and the proportion of the labour force in manufacturing. Some commonalities are also observed in these CMAs regarding the influence of ethnic origin. For example, in Toronto and Vancouver both British and South East European ethnic origin are negatively associated with socioeconomic status. Some similarities are also observed between Toronto and Ottawa where members of North West European ethnic origin indicate positive association with socioeconomic status.

For model two again these CMAs indicate some similarities which are more apparent between Vancouver and Ottawa. In both of these CMAs the variables influencing socioeconomic status, in order of importance, are age, sex, proportion of the labour force in manufacturing and use of English as a home language. Some deviations from this pattern were observed for the CMA of Toronto, where use of English as a home language has been found to be the most influential variable; followed by age, sex and proportion of labour force in manufacturing.

Some broad similarities were also observed between the patterns that emerged in Edmonton and Calgary. For example, in both Edmonton and Calgary sex has the strongest influence on socioeconomic status, followed by use of English as home language and proportion of labour force in manufacturing. The differences observed between the two CMAs relate to the influence of ethnic variables. In Calgary, British and South East European ethnic origin, Edmonton have a strong negative influence on socioeconomic status, while in Edmonton it is the French ethnic origin that has a similar negative association.

St. Catherines and Hamilton are similar in that age and sex, followed by proportion of labour force in manufacturing industries are the most important variables in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status. Both CMAs also indicate that use of English as home

language has a fairly strong relationship with socioeconomic status. This commonality can perhaps be accounted for by the almost identical ethnic composition of these two CMAs.

Some similarities were observed for the CMAs of Kitchener, Winnipeg, Quebec and Montreal with use of English as a home language, and proportion of the labour force in manufacturing as being the strongest variables influencing socioeconomic status. This is true for models one and two. It is suggested that the strong positive association between proportion of labour force in manufacturing and socioeconomic status for these CMAs could perhaps be attributed to an interaction effect of ethnic origin and proportion of labour force in manufacturing.

While each CMA indicates some differences in the pattern of variation in socioeconomic status, some commonalities are nonetheless observed for some of these CMAs. However, the CMA of Halifax is the only one that exhibits a truly unique pattern. Like most other CMAs, it indicated age as the most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. However, following age, the set of variables that appeared to influence socioeconomic status were mobility and nativity (which had not been the case for any of the other CMAs).

Similar results were observed for model two which indicates that in Halifax, aside from age as an influential force in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status, more dynamic forces such as mobility as well as nativity are influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. It was explained earlier that this strong positive association between nativity and socioeocnomic status and mobility status and socieoocnomic status could perhaps be due to the fact that the members of the foreign-born group in this CMA are also the ones who are more mobile and therefore are more likely to occupy high socioeconomic status.

On the whole, for most of the CMAs the demographic factors are more influential than ethnic factors in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. This is more apparent in larger cities (with the exception of Montreal) which exhibit greater demographic variability than smaller cities.

7. AGGREGATE ANALYSES

The intent of this study is to examine patterns of variation in socioeconomic status not only at individual but also at the aggregate level. It has been noted earlier (Chapter 2,) that individual behaviour or orientation is often influenced by extrinsic factors, more specifically factors that may be operating at a group or aggregate level. Thus, structural analysis may help us understand the context within which inequalities occur. In this study an analysis at an aggregate level will enhance our understanding of intermetropolitan differences from a broader framework, in contrast to the individual level analysis which intra metropolitan differences within a micro framework. Often studies attempted at the individual level indicate results that are different from studies at the aggregate level. Since micro level analyses have already been dealt in this study, we now turn our attention to macro or aggregate level analyses.

The results of the aggregate analyses are presented in three stages. In the first stage the results of the zero order correlation matrix, means and standard deviations of the variables included in the analysis are presented, which is followed by the results of the multiple regression analysis. In the final stage, the results regarding the influence of city size are delineated.

7.1 The Results of Zero Order Matrix

Table B-22 in Appendix B provides the results of the zero order correlation matrix, meeans and standard deviations of the variables included in the analysis. Most of the variables representing ethnic origin are statistically significant, whereas most of the demographic variables are statistically not significant.

Multicollinearity is observed between British ethnic origin and French ethnic origin (-.864); between British ethnic origin and use of English as a home language (.893); between British ethnic origin and use of French as a home language (-.883); between French ethnic origin and use of French as a home language (.942); between French ethnic origin and use of

English as a home language (-.973); between use of French as a home language and use of English as home language (-.899).

The means and standard deviations of the variables representing ethnic origins appear to indicate some consistency when we compare them with the corresponding values derived from the individual level analyses for the thirteen CMAs. (See Tables B-9 to B-21 in Appendix B). Among the variables representing ethnic origins, the standard deviation for the French ethnic origin (28.670) is relatively higher than the rest of the ethnic origins. This is to be expected considering the wide variation in the proportion of the French ethnic group across the CMAs. For example, at the individual level, the CMAs of Montreal (Table B-10 in Appendix B) Ottawa (Table B-12 in Appendix B), and Quebec (Table B-16 in Appendix B), represented by a much higher proportions of members of French ethnic origin than the other CMAs.

The mean (49.329) and the relatively low standard deviation (2.336) of the male group again also indicate some consistency when compared with their corresponding values of the thirteen CMAs which again, did not reflect much variation.

The proportion of members who are mobile indicated a high standard deviation, which is consistent with findings observed at the individual level where the proprotions of mobile members varied from a high of 67.4% in Calgary (Table B-14 in Appendix B) to a low of 38.7% in Winnipeg (Table B-15 in Appendix B).

7.2 The Results of Multiple Regression Analyses

To maintain consistency with earlier analyses at individual level, two models were employed, each of which is discussed sequentially.

7.2.1 Model One

The results of mulltiple regression analyses are provided in Table 7-1. Multicollinearity was indicated in the zero order correlation matrix (see Table B-22 in Appendix B) between certain variables, so that five different sets of analyses were employed. In the first set, British ethnic origin was included and all other variables with which it had multicollinearity were excluded.

In the second set of analyses, French ethnic origin was included and all other variables with which it had multicollinearity were excluded from the analyses. In the third set, use of English as a home language was included and all other variables with which it had multicollinearity were excluded. In the fourth set, use of French as a home language was included and all other variables with which it had multicollinearity were excluded. In the fifth set of analyses, use of language other than English or French was included and all other variables with which it had multicollinearity were excluded.

The results of only the third analyses involving use of English as a home language is reported in Table-7-1 because the regression coefficients were found to be statistically significant and the adjusted R^2 (.663) was found to be considerably higher than in the other sets of the analyses. To maintain consistency with our earlier format, the results are examined under two broad headings i.e ethnic and demographic variables.

7.2.1.1 Ethnic Variables

Among the ethnic variables, nativity appears to have a relatively stronger influence on socioeconomic status (B.516) than ethnic origin or use of English as a home language. In other words, variation in nativity at an aggregate level is relatively greater than variation in use of English as a home language and ethnic origin. [2] Use of English as home language is the next strongest variable in influencing socioeconomic status (B.406) indicating that with an increase in the proportion of the group using English as a home

[2]We have to keep in mind that each variable in the aggregate analysis aside from being an aggregate value of each CMA, has been broken down into ten categories by age.

TABLE-7-1 AGGREGATE EFFECTS OF ETHNIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Variables	b	s.e. b	t	*B*
Ethnic Variables				
N.W.Eur	-.000	.003	- .297	-.027
S.E.Eur	-.007	.002	-3.135	-.283**
Non Eur	-.005	.004	-1.354	
Mult Id	-.053	.008	-6.598	-.922*
English Language	.002	.000	3.000	.406
French Language	---	---	---	---
Nativity	.007	.001	3.934	.516*
Demographic Variables				
Sex	.004	.005	.831	.051
Mobility	.008	.000	11.403	.895*
Family	.000	.000	.174	.011
Manufacturing	-.006	.001	- 4.088	-.334*
Constant	1.253	.239	5.231	

Multiple R	.831
R^2	.691
Adj R^2	.663
S.E.	.119
DF	10/109
F	24.452

*Significant at .01 level

language, there is a rise in socioeconomic status. Among the variables representing ethnic origin, multiple ethnic identity shows a strong but negative association with socioeconomic status (*B*-.922), meaning that socioeconomic status declines more sharply with an increase in the proportion of ethnic groups with multiple identity, than with a comparable increase in the other ethnic groups. Ethnic groups of South East European origin (*B*-.283) have the next strongest influence on socioeconomic status meaning that among the variables representing ethnic origin, South East European ethnic origin is associated with the sharpest decline in socioeconomic status. The beta coefficient for all the other variables representing ethnic origin are statistically insignificant.

7.2.1.2 Demographic Variables

The results concerning the demographic variables indicate some exceptions to the to the findings reported earlier in the study. For example, sex, more specifically proportion of male, is no longer the most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status (*B*.051). It was in fact found to be statistically insignificant. Instead, mobility status was found to be the most influential variable in explaining variation in socioeconomic status (B.895), followed by proportion of the labour force in manufacturing (*B*-.334). The positive association between mobility and socioeconomic status indicates that the larger the group of mobile people, the higher the socioeconomic status. This positive association between mobility status and socioeconomic status reaffirms our earlier hypothesis regarding these two variables. (Refer to Chapter 2, section 2.5, hypothesis 8).

7.2.2 Model Two

The results of model two are provided in Table 7-2. High multicollinearity between use of English and between use of French as a home language (-.899) has made it necessary to employ two independent multiple regression analyses, wherein use of English as a home

TABLE 7-2 AGGREGATE EFFECTS OF ETHNIC DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECOLOGICAL FACTORS ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Variables	b	s.e b	t	*B*
Ethnic Variables				
Nativity	.008	.001	6.687	.599*
Eng Language	.004	.001	3.110	.604
Demographic Variables				
Sex	-.076	.164	-.462	-.040
Mobility	.005	.000	7.386	.544*
Family	-.002	.000	-3.494	-.264**
Manufact	-.005	.001	-3.666	-.294**
Minority	-.002	.001	-1.301	-.238
Constant	1.722	.333		
Multiple R	.687			
R Sq		.472		
Adj R Sq		.439		
SE	.144			
DF	7/112			
F	14/330			

* Significant at .01 level
**Significant at .05 level

language was excluded in the first analyses and use of French as a home language was excluded in the second. The results of only the first set of analyses are provided in Table 7-2, because, the adjusted R^2 is slightly higher than in the second set of analyses.

7.2.2.1 Ethnic Variables

Overall, the ethnic variables appear to be more influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status than the demographic variables. Among the ethnic variables, use of English as a home language appears to have a stronger influence on socioeconomic status (*B*.604) than nativity (*B*.599). This finding is consistent with the earlier results at an individual level. The effect of minority status on socioeconomic status (*B*-.238) is statistically insignificant which again is consistent with the results of individual level analyses.

7.2.2.2 Demographic Variables

The results pertaining to the demographic variables are almost identical to those reported for model one. Mobility status (*B*.544) appears to have the strongest influence on socioeconomic status, followed by proportion of the labour force in manufacturing (*B*-.294).

The positive association between mobility and socioeconomic status and the negative association between proportion of the labour force in manufacturing and socioeconomic status are in congruence with our earlier results. However, in contrast to earlier results, family size appears to have a fairly strong influence on socioeconomic status (*B*-.214). The influence of sex on socioeconomic status is statistically insignificant.

7.2.3 Influence of City Size

The hypothesis under consideration here is that city size is likely to have an influence in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. In order to test this hypothesis, a breakdown procedure was employed whereby the mean standard deviation of socioeconomic status of ethnic origins for each CMA was examined at an individual level. The same procedure has been applied at the aggregate level. The standard deviation of the mean socioeconomic status of ethnic groups for each CMA, is employed as an index of disparity in socioeconomic status. The higher the standard deviation, the greater the disparity in socioeconomic status. According to our hypothesis disparity in socioeconomic status increases with an increase in city size. This means that the largest city should have the highest standard deviation. It is however, apparent from Table 7-3, that this is not the case. Toronto, which is the largest CMA, does not show the highest standard deviation. The results indicate that Ottawa the fourth largest CMA has the highest standard deviation (.232), followed by Quebec (.204). Moreover, both Vancouver (.191) and Halfax (.193) have almost identical standard deviations though the two CMAs differ considerably in size. Parenthetically, it is worth noting that the above results might have been different if an alternative methodological procedure was used. This would entail treating each CMA as a variable in regression analyses. Thus, the hypothesis concerning city size and socioeconomic status of ethnic groups is not confirmed.

7.3 Summary and Discussion

The results of the aggregate analyses indicate that both ethnic and demographic variables are influential in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status. Among the ethnic variables, multiple ethnic identity has a strong but negative effect on socioeconomic status. This means that socioeconomic status decilnes more sharply with multiple ethnic identity than with other ethnic identity. Further, it reflects considerable intermetropolitan variation regarding the influence of multiple ethnic identity on socioeocnomic status.

TABLE 7-3 AGGREGATE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS FOR THE CMAs

Variables	X	SD
Toronto	1.707	.199
Montreal	1.693	.166
Vancouver	1.729	.191
Ottawa	1.822	.232
Edmonton	1.734	.180
Calgary	1.768	.196
Winnipeg	1.654	.173
Quebec	1.725	.204
Hamilton	1.624	.182
London	1.669	.188
St. Catherines	1.557	.163
Kitchener	1.612	.184
Halifax	1.693	.193

It has also been found that, at the individual level, certain ethnic origins such as South East European and the French who indicated a much stronger negative association with socioeconomic status than those with multiple ethnic identity, do not appear to do so at the aggregate level. This means that there is little intermetropolitan variation in the influence of South East European and French ethnic groups on socioeconomic status.

English as a home language and nativity appear to have a fairly strong influence on socioeconomic status for both models. But their influence is relatively stronger for model two, indicating that the effects of both English as a home language and nativity on socioeconomic status, are stronger when the effects of ethnic origin are taken into account. Such effects were not very apparent at the individual level analyses. No distinctive patterns were apparent from the analyses of the thirteen samples representing the thirteen CMAs. While some CMAs such as Toronto, Vancouver, Edmonton, Hamilton and London indicated a relatively weak influence of use of English as a home language on socioeconomic status when the effects of ethnic origin are not taken into account, others like Winnipeg, Vancouver, St. Catherines and Kitchener indicated a slightly stronger influence of nativity on socioeconomic status when the effects of ethnic origin are not taken into account. This inconsistency regarding the impact of ethnic origin at the individual and group level raises questions for future research.

Among the demographic variables, it was observed that for models one and two, sex was no longer an influential factor in accounting for variation in socioeconomic status. Rather, mobility status appeared to be a more influential variable.

The fact that sex had a strong influence on socioeconomic status at the individual level but not at the aggregate level is probably a reflection of similarity in sex composition across CMAs.

Also, at the aggregate level, mobility status and proportion of labour force in manufacturing industries are more influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status than at the individual level. This may be a function of intermetropolitan differences in the distribution of these variables. In fact, Tables B-9 to B-22 indicate that proportion of mobile population as well as proportion of labour force in manufacturing, varies considerably from

one CMA to another.

Finally, with reference to the impact of sex on socioeconomic status, the findings derived from the individual and aggregate levels of analysis are quite different. At the individual level, sex proved to be the most important variable influencing socioeconomic status. In contrast, at the aggregate level, sex is relatively unimportant in influencing variation in socioeconomic status, probably because the CMAs under consideration reflect little variation in sex composition. These observations are mere speculations but they may suggest fruitful avenues for future research.

8. CONCLUSION

This study set out to examine the influence of ethnic, demographic and ecological variables on socioeconomic status. In this concluding chapter, an attempt is made to recapitulate and synthesize the main findings that emerged from the study and to discuss the implications of these findings for future inquiry. The inquiry was addressed at an individual level as well as at an aggregate level. At an individual level, the analyses were carried out for four different types of samples, which were: the sample representing the national population, the sub-sample representing the members of the foreign-born group, the sub-samples representing the members of the ethnic groups, and the sub-samples representing the CMAs.

A number of interesting features emerged from this study. For the individual level analyses, demographic variables appeared to be more influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status than ethnic variables. This fact indicates that there is indeed some merit in including demographic variables for explaining inequality in socioeconomic status. The inclusion of demographic variables adds a new dimension to the existing bi-polar model of ascription and achievement in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. This can be regarded as a contribution to the theory of status attainment. The theoretical framework for this study was built around the premise of the status attainment model, pertaining to ascription and achievement, whereby a set of demographic and ecological variables has also been incorporated to examine inequality in socioeconomic status. Since the results indicated that demographic and ecological variables were indeed influential in explaining inequality in socioeconomic status, in addition to ascriptive factors such as ethnicity and achievement factors such as level of education, we can regard this finding as a contribution towards furthering our understanding of the status attainment model.

Among the demographic variables, sex appeared to be the most important variable in explaining inequality in sociecocnomic status. This finding is consistent with earlier studies documenting the prevalence of gender inequality. (Abella 1986, Boyd 1986, and Fox 1986).

The present study has not only reaffirmed the earlier findings of gender inequality but also ackowledged this inequality as a more critical factor than ethnic inequality. Moreover this finding reemphasizes the syndrome of male dominance in the labour market and raises questions regarding the underlying explanation for such inequality. More intensive research along this direction is warranted.

Inasmuch as sex emerged as the strongest variable in explaining inequality in socioeocnomic status, family size appeared to be the least influential variable in explaining this inequality. This weak influence of family size on socioeocnomic status is not to suggest that family size is no longer functional in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. It is quite likely that there is not enough variation in family size in Canada to have a startling influence on socioeocnomic status. In fact, it has been demonstrated by researchers that family size tends to show a convergence. For example, Keyfitz (1962) contends that in the Canadian context the size of family has tended to be more uniform.

Among the ethnic variables, use of English as home language was found to be the most influential variable in explaining inequality in socioeocnomic status. The inescapable conclusion suggested by this finding is that linguistic assimilation is a critical factor for attaining high socioeconomic status.

Moreover, the fact that ethnic origin has a relatively weaker influence on socioeconomic status compared to nativity and use of English as a home language, reaffirms the need to use multiple indicators of ethnicity for examining ethnic variation in socioeconomic status.

It was also observed that of the two official languages, proficiency in English was far more influential for attaining high socioeocnomic status than proficiency in French. This empirical reality appears to question the presumed equal status of Canada's official languages. The French-Canadians in Quebec may have good reason to be concerned about the survival of the French language and culture. There is need for more research in this area.

The analyses were also carried out at an aggregate level by analyzing the data for each CMA. Some variations were observed for the results from the aggregate level analyses. Both

ethnic and demographic variables were found to be strongly influential in explaining variation in socioeconomic status. This is in contrast to the individual level analyses where demographic variables were found to be relatively stronger than ethnic variables in influencing socioeconomic status. This difference between the findings from the individual and from the aggregate level analyses indicates the value of these two levels of analyses. It reemphasizes our earlier assumption that factors influential in explaining inequality in socioeconomic status at an individual level, may not be functional for explaining disparity in socioeconomic status at an aggregate level. For example, in contrast to the individual level analyses for the CMAs, where sex and age were found to have the strongest influence on sccioeconomic status, proportion of mobile population as well as proportion of labour force in manufacturing had the strongest influence in explaining variation in socieconomic status at the aggregate level. The relatively weak influence of age and sex on socioeconomic status at the aggregate level, indicates little intermetropolitan variation in age and sex composition. Contrary to this, the strong influence of mobiltiy status and proportion of labour force in manufacturing industries indicate greater intermetropolitan variation in terms of mobility status and proportion of labour force in manufacturing industries.

All in all, the findings of this study indicate that ethnic variables are relatively less influential in explaining variation in socioeocnomic status. Among the ethnic variables, ethnic origin in particular has a relatively weak influence on socioeconomic status. This is not to suggest that ethnicity is no longer important in influencing socioeconomic status. Indeed, different indicators of ethnicity seem to have different effects on socioeconomic status. Further investigation needs to be undertaken, before one can arrive at any level of generalization. For example, it may be that changes in immigration policy and attempts to recruit more professional and skilled immigrants from overseas, have temporarily masked ethnic differences in occupational distribution. Therefore, future research needs to address the short term as well long term impact of immigration policy.

The methodological problems involved in measuring ethnic origin also need to be taken into consideration. Ethnic origin, as a representation of ancestral roots indicates very

little of one's current affiliation or subjective sense of belongingness. Ethnic identity should be examined in more detail. For example, ethnicity has different meanings for people varying by time, generation and place. For the first generation immigrant groups, ethnicity plays a very important role, whereas it takes a more symbolic meaning for the subsequent generations. Thus, ethnicity is a dynamic and multifaceted aspect of the Canadian experience. Probably it will continue to play a role in effecting the life chances of different ethnic groups.

9. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abella R.S.
1984 Equality in Employment, A Royal Commission Report Ottawa Ministry of Supply of Canada.

Anderson A.B. and J.S. Frideres,
1980 Ethnicity in Canada, Theoretical Perspectives. Toronto: Butterworths.

Blalock H.M.

1956 "Economic Discrimination and Negro Increase", American Sociological Review 21:527-528.

1957 "Percent Non-White and Discrimination in the South", American Sociological Review 22:667-682.
1967 Towards a Theory of MInority Group Relations. New York: Wiley.

Blishen B.R.,
1967 "A Socioeconomic Index for Occupation in Canada", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 4 (Feb) 41-53

1970 "Social Class and Opportunity in Canada",

Blau P. M. and O.D. Duncan
1967 The American Occupational Structure. New York. John Wiley & Sons.

Blau P.M.,
1967 Inequality and Heterogeneity: A Primitive Theory of Social Structure. New York: Free Press.

Boulet J., and C. Veltman,
1981 "Socioeconomic Achievements of Montreal Language Groups in 1971", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 18: 239-248.

Boyd M.,
1981 "Status Attainment in Canada", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 18 (5): 657-673.

1985 "Immigration and Occupational Attainment in Canada", in Boyd et. al (eds)., Ascription and Achievement Studies in Mobility and Status Attainment in Canada. Ottawa: Carleton University Press. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 7 (2):10-27.

Breton R., J. G. Reitz and F. Valentine,
1980 Cultural Boundaries and Cohesion of Canada. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Breton R., and H. Roseborough,
1969 "Ethnic Differences in Status", in B.R. Blishen et al (ed.), Canadian Society. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada.

Brown D.L. and G. Fuguitt.,
1972 "Percent Non-White and Racial Disparity in Nonmetropolitan Cities in the South", Social Science Quarterly 53:573-582.

Chimbos P.D.,
1974 "Ethnicity and Occupational Mobility, Comparative Study of Greek and Slovak Immigrants in Ontario City", International Journal of Comparative Sociology15:57-67

Clement W.,
1975 "Inequality of Access: Characteristics of the Canadian Corporate Elite", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 12 :33-52.

Conant J. B.,
1961 The American High School. New York: Mc.Graw-Hill

Cuneo C. and J. Curtis
1975 "Social Ascription in the Educational and Occupational Status Attainment of Urban Canadians", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 12 (Feb) 6-24.

Darroch A. G. and W. G. Marston
1971 "The Social Class Basis of Ethnic Residential Segregation: the Canadian Case", American Journal of Sociology 77:3 491-510.

1972 "Ethnic Differentiation: Ecological Aspects of a Multidimensional Concept", in A.H. Richmond (ed) Readings in Race and Ethnic Relations. New York: Pergamon Press.

Darroch A. G.,
1980 "Another Look at Ethnicity Stratification and Social Mobility in Canada", J.E. Goldstein and R.M. Bienvenue (eds.), Ethnicity and Ethnic Relations in Canada. Toronto: Butterworths.

Denton M., and A. Hunter
1982 Economic Sectors and Gender Discrimination in Canada A Critique and Test of Block and Walker and Some New Evidence. Ottawa: Woman's Bureau, Labour Canada.

Dofny, Jacques and M. Rioux,
1964 "Social Class in French Canada", in Marcel Rioux and Yves Martin (eds.), French-Canadian Society. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

Driedger et al
1982 "Ethnic Identification, Variations in Regional and National Preferences", Canadian Ethnic Studies XIV (3):57-68.

Duncan B. and O.D. Duncan,
1955 "Residential Distribution and Occupational Stratification", American Journal of Sociology LX 493-503.

Duncan B., and O.D. Duncan,
1968 "Minorities and the Process of Stratification", American Sociological Review 33, 356-364

Featherman D.L.,
1971 "The Socioeconomic Achievement of White Religio-Ethnic Subgroups: Social and Psychological Explanations", American Sociological Review 36 (April): 207-222.

Fischer C.,
1971 "A Research Note on Urbanism and Tolerance", American Journal of Sociology 76:847-856.

Forcese D.,
1986 The Canadian Class Structure. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Fox B. and J. Fox,
1986 "Women in the Labour Market 1931-81: Exclusion and Competition", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 23:1-21.

Frisbie W.P. and L. Neidert,
1977 "Inequality and the Relative Size of Minority Populations: A Comparative Analysis", American Journal of Sociology 32:1007-1030.

Gallaway L. E.
1967a "Industry Variations in Geographic Labour Mobility Patterns", Journal of Human Resources 2: 461-474.

1967b Interindustry Labour Mobility in the United States 1957 to 1960. Washington, D.C.:

U.S.G.P.O.

1969 Geographic Labour Mobility in the United States 1957 to 1960. Washington D.C. U.S.G.P.O.

Gibbon J. M.,
1938 Canadian Mosaic, the Making of a Northern Nation Toronto: McClelland.

Giddens A,
1973 The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies. London: Hutchinson and Company.

Goyder J.,
1981 "Income Difference Between the Sexes: Findings From a National Canadian Survey", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 18: 321-342

Gujarati D.,
1978 Basic Econometrics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hoch I.,
1976 "City Size Effects Trends and Policies", Science 193: 856-863.

Indra D.,
1980 Changes in Canadian Immigration Policy Over the Past Decade with Special Reference to Asia, in K.V. Ujimoto and G. Hirabayashi (eds.), Visible Minorities and Multiculturalism. Toronto: Butterworths.

Jiobu R. M., and H.H. Marshall, Jr.
1971 "Urban Structure and Differentiation Between Blacks and Whites" American Sociological Review 36: 638-649.

Kalbach W. E.,
1976 The Impact of Immigrants on Canada's Population. Census Monograph. Ottawa: The Queeen's Printer.

Kenneth C.W.,
1970 An Introduction to Population. Chicago: The Dorsey Press.

Keyfitz N.,
1962 "New Patterns of Birth Rate, Canadian Population and Northern Colonization" in V.W. Balden (ed.) Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lagory M., and R.J. Magnani,
1979 "Structural Correlates of Black-White Occupational Differentiation: Will U.S. Regional Differences in Status Remain?" Social Problems 27: 157-169.

Lamphier C. M., and R. N.Morris,
1974 "The Stratification of Ethnic Immigrants: the Case Between Anglophones and Francophones", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 11:53-66.

Lautard E.H. and D.J. Loree,
1984 "Ethnic Stratification in Canada, 1931-1971", Canadian Journal of Sociology 9 (3): 333-344.

Marx Karl and F. Engels,
1969a Selected Works. New York: Oxford University Press.

Noel D. L.,
1968
"A Theory of th Origin of Ethnic Stratification", Social Problem 16: 157-172.

Li Peter S.,
1978 "The Stratification of Ethnic Immigrants: the Case of Toronto", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology", 15: 30-40

1988 Ethnic Inequality in a Class Society. Toronto: Wail and Thompson.

Martin W.T. and D.L. Poston Jr.,
1972 "The Occupation Composition of White Females: Sexism, Racism and Occupational Differentiation", Social Forces 50: 349-355.

McRoberts H.A.,
1985 "Mobility and Attainment in Canada, the Effects of Origin", in Boyd et al (eds.), Ascription and Achievement Studies in Mobility and Status Attainment in Canada, Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Multiculturism Directorate
1984 National Strategy in Race Relations, Ottawa: Government of Canada.

Nam C. B.,
1959 "Nationality Groups and Social Stratification", Social Forces 37: 328-333.

Ornstein M. D.
1981 "The Occupational Mobility of Men in Ontario", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology", 18: 183-215.

Pineo P. C. Porter J. and H. A Mc.Roberts,
1977 "The 1971 Census and the Socioeconomic Classification of Occupation", 14: 91-102.

Pineo P. C.,

1985 "Internal Migration and Occupational Attainment", in Boyd et. al (eds.) Ascription and Achievement Studies in Mobility and Status Attainment in Canada. Ottawa: Carleton University Press

Porter J.,
1965 The Vertical Mosaic. Toronto: University of Press.

Ray Michael D.,
1976 Canadian Urban Trends. Toronto: Copp Clark Association with the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs and Printing and Publishing Supply and Service.

Rex J.,
1970 Race Relations in Sociological Theory. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Reitz J.,
1977 "Analysis of Changing Group Inequalities in a Changing Occupational Structure", in P. Krishnan (ed.), Mathematical Models in Sociology, Sociological Review, Monograph 24: 167-197. Keele Staffordshire: University of Keele.

Richmond A. H.,
1967a Post-War Immigrants in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

1973 "Social Mobility of Immigrants", in J.E. Curtis and W. G. Scott (eds.), Social Stratification, Scarborough: Prenctice-Hall of Canada.

Richmond A. H. and W. E. Kalbach,
1980 "Factors in the Adjustment of Immigrants and their Descendents". (Cat. 99-761) Ottawa: Ministry of Suppy and Service.

Rocher G.,
1975 "Formal Education: The Issue of Opportunity", in Forcese and Richar (eds.), Issues in Canadian Society, An Introduction to Sociology, Scarborough: Prentice-Hall of Canada, Ltd.

Rosen B. C.,
1956 "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychological Dimension of Social Stratification", American Sociological Review, 21: 2203-211.

1959 "Race Ethnicity and the Achievement Syndrome", American Sociological Review 24: 47-60.

Sandefur G.D. and Wilbur J. Scott,
1981 "A Dynamic Analysis of Migration: An Assessment of the Effects of Age Family and Career Variables", Demography 18: 355-368.

Sexton C.P.,
1961 Education and Income: Inequality of Opportunity in the Public Schools, New York: Viking Press.

Sharma R. D.,
1980 Migration and Fertility, Ph.D Dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Alberta, Edmonton Alberta.

Semyonov M., and R. I. Scott,
1983 Percent Black Community Characteristics and Race-Linked Occupational Differentiation in the Rural South", Rural Sociology 48: 240-252.

1984 "Place Race and Differential Occupational Opportunities", Demography 21: 259-270

Shibutani T. and K.M. Kwan,
1965 Ethnic Stratification, A Comparattive Approach. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Simpson G.E. and J. M. Yinger,
1965 Racial and Cultural Minorities - An Analysis of Racial and Cultural Minorities. New York: Harper and Row

Tepperman L.,
1975 Social Mobility in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Trovato F., and C. F. Grindstaff,
1986 "Economic Status: A Census Analysis of Immigrant Women at Age Thirty in Canada", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 23 (4): 569-587.

Turner R.,
1951 "The Relative Position of the Negro Male in the Labour Force of Large American Cities", American Sociological Review 16:524-529.

Van den Berghe P.L.,
1978 Race and Racism, A Comparative Perspective. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Weber M.,
1968 "Class, Status Party" in H. H. gerth nad C. Wright Mills (eds.), From Max Weber. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wirth L.,
1938 "Urbanism As a Way of Life", American Sociological Review 44:1-24.

Wilcox J., and W. C. Roof,
1978 "Percent Black and Black-White Status Inequality: Southern Versus Non-Southern

Patterns", Social Science Quarterly 59: 422-434.

Wright E. O.,
1979 Class Structure and Income Determinants, New York: Academic Press.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF VARIABLES

APPENDIX- A LIST OF VARIABLES

Ethnic Origin:

00 not applicable refers to inmates

01 British

02 French

03 African, Carribbean

04 Chinese

05 Croatian Serbian

06 Czech and Slovak

07 Dutch

08 German

09 Greek

10 Italian

11 Jewish

12 Hungarian

13 Polish

14 Portuguese

15 Scandinavian

16 Ukrainian

17 Other Single nec

18 British and french

19 British and Other

20 French and Other

21 British French and Other

22 Other Multiple Responses

PLace of Birth

00 Not Applicable (refers to inmates)

01 Newfoundland

02 Prince Edward Island

03 Nova Scotia

04 New Brunswick

05 Quebec

06 Ontario

07 Manitoba

08 Saskatchewan

09 Alberta

10 British Columbia

11 Yukon

12 North West Territories

13 United States

14 Belgium and Luxembourg

15 France

16 Germany

17 Netherlands

18 Austria

19 Republic of Ireland

20 United Kingdom

21 Yugoslavia

22 Greece

23 Italy

24 Portugal

25 Hungary

26 Poland

27 U.S.S.R.

28 Czechoslovakia

29 Other Europe nec

30 Asia

31 Africa

32 South and Central America

33 Other (not classified elsewhere)

Highest Level of Schooling

00 Not applicable refers to inmates and persons under 15 years

01 Less than grade 5

02 Grade 5-8

04 High School Graduates

05 Trades Certificate

06 Without trade/Non University

03 Grades 9-13

07 With Trade Certificate

08 With Other Non-University

09 Univ without Certificate

10 Univ with Certificate

11 Univ with Bachelor's degree or Higher

Occupational Categories

00 Not Applicable inmates and persons who have not worked since January 1980

01 Managerial

02 Natural Sciences

03 Social Sciences

04 Teaching

05 Medicine & Health

06 Artistic Literary

07 Clerical

08 Sales

09 Service

10 Farming

11 Other Primary Group

12 Processing Occupation

13 Machining and Repair

14 Construction Trades

15 Transport Equipments

16 Other Occupations

Year Of Immigration

00 Not Applicable inmates and persons who were Canadian citizens by birth

01 Before 1946

02 1946-1955

03 1956-1960

04 1961-1965

05 1966

06 1967-1970

07 1971

08 1972

09 1973

10 1974

11 1975

12 1976

13 1977

14 1978

15 1979

16 1980

17 1981

Mobility Status

00 Not Applicable inmates, persons under 5 years and persons outsode Canada

01 Same Dwelling

02 Different Dwelling/ Same Census Sub-Division

03 Different Census Sub-Division/ Same Census Division

04 Different Census Division/Same Province

05 Different Province

06 Outside Canada

Number of Persons in Census Family

00 Not Applicable Persons in Household Outside Canada and temporary residents

01 non-family persons

02 two persons

03 three persons

04 four persons

05 five persons

06 six persons

07 seven persons

08 eight persons

09 nine persons

10 ten or more persons

TABLE A-1 DESCRIPTION OF ABBREVIATED VARIABLES

Abbreviated	Name of Variables Complete Names
British	Proportion of Members of British Ethnic Origin
French	Proportion of Members of French Ethnic Origin
N.W.Euro	Proportion of Members of North West European Origin
S.E. Euro	Proportion of Members of South East European Origin
Non-Euro	Proportion of Members of non-European Origin
Mult Id	Proportion of Members with Multiple Ethnic Origin
Eng Lang	Proportion of Members Who Use English as Home Language
Fren Lang	Proportion of Members Who Use French as Home Language
Nativity	Proportion of Members Who Are Foreign-Born
Family	Size of Familiy
Mobility	Mobility Status
Manufac	Proportion of Labour Force in Manufacturing
Minority	Porportion of Members Who Are Regarded As Minority

APPENDIX B
LIST OF MATRICES

APPENDIX B - LIST OF MATRICES

TABLE B-1

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES FOR THE NATIONAL SAMPLE

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.507	-.258	-.266	-.243	.533	-.433	-.115	.013	.033	-.006	-.041	.004*	.054	.030
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.198	-.205	-.187	-.700	.856	-.258	-.031	-.024	-.004	.023	-.031	-.084	-.085
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.104	-.095	.160	-.174	.093	.026	.029	.008	-.006	-.001*	.045	.032
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.098	-.052	-.175	.280	-.053	.045	.013	.022	-.042	-.042	.027
MULT ID	5					1.000	-.029	-.147	.280	.030	-.029	.001*	.013	.070	.014	.006
ENGLISH LANGUAGE	6						1.000	-.838	-.054	.050	-.022	.005*	-.048	.037	.115	.098
FRENCH LANGUAGE	7							1.000	-.225	-.016	-.020	-.004	.029	-.041	-.076	-.097
NATIVITY	8								1.000	.046	.140	.005*	.008	.040	.056	.037
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES																
EDUC	9									1.000	-.076	.049	-.082	.136	.746	.244
AGE	10										1.000	-.011	-.188	-.232	.051	-.069
SEX	11											1.000	.022	-.006	.195	.284
FAM	12												1.000	-.239	-.102	-.081
MOB	13													1.000	.123	.106
OCC	14														1.000	.463
SES	15															1.000
X		39.5	27.9	9.2	9.5	8.7	67.8	25.0	17.9	4.410	35.615	49.9	3.278	49.7	2.328	.000
STD DEV										2.144	14.222		1.598		1.250	1.000

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level. For variables representing ethnic origin, home language, nativity and mobility, the proportions have been included since these were dichotomous variables.

TABLE B-2

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE SAMPLE OF THE FOREIGN-BORN GROUP

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.116	-.259	-.380	-.353	.462	-.117	.089	.051	-.032	-.076	.008	-.097	-.089	.023	-.077
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.078	-.114	-.107	-.152	.598	.028	-.010	.003	-.028	.017	.007	-.033	.000*	-.026
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.255	-.238	.141	-.046	.044	.100	.007*	-.008	-.076	-.177	-.056	-.032	-.013
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.348	-.354	-.078	-.287	.061	.032	.081	-.130	-.154	.008	.014	-.122
MULT ID	5					1.000	-.197	-.005	.132	-.173	.002*	.016	.172	.398	.161	-.120	-.017
ENG. LANG.	6						1.000	-.276	.209	-.024	.004*	-.062	.002*	-.264	-.244	-.026	-.051
FR. LANG.	7							1.000	.059	-.026	.024	-.076	.008	-.097	-.089	-.961	-.077
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
EDUC	8								1.000	-.148	.121	-.084	.145	.081	-.020	-.626	.110
AGE	9									1.000	.001	-.173	-.329	-.429	.461	-.121	-.048
SEX	10										1.000	.016	.018	-.018	-.007	.218	-.319
FAMS	11											1.000	-.119	.000*	-.062	-.070	.002
MOB	12												1.000	.409	.005	.061	.002
YRIMMIG	13													1.000	.351	-.048	-.007
IMMIAGE	14														1.000	.030	.013
SES	15															1.000	.052
OCC	16																1.000
X		28.2	3.3	15.0	26.6	24.8	62.4	4.1	4.634	39.773	50.9	3.166	49.7	5.665	3.349	.000	1.710
STD DEV									2.387	13.256		1.316		3.349	1.223	.998	1.086

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-3

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES FOR THE SAMPLE OF BRITISH ETHNIC GROUP

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
ETHNIC VARIABLES:											
ENG. LANG.	1	1.000	-.965	.001*	-.012*	.011	-.007	.000*	-.013*	.005*	.007*
FR. LANG.	2		1.000	-.031*	.012*	-.012	.006*	.001*	.012*	.003	.009*
NATIVITY	3			1.000	.075	.122	-.014	-.021	.038	.091	.015
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:											
EDUC	4				1.000	-.019	.040	-.078	.127	.739	.227
AGE	5					1.000	-.023	-.217	-.250	.104	-.096
SEX	6						1.000	.018	-.003	.280	.196
FAMS	7							1.000	-.216	-.096	-.069
MOB	8								1.000	.111	.108
SBS	9									1.000	.444
OCC	10										1.000
X		98.4	1.5	12.6	4.397	36.240	49.5	3.078	50.1	.067	2.374
S.D.					2.637	14.553		1.333		1.010	1.219

* With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-4

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES FOR THE SAMPLE OF FRENCH ETHNIC GROUP

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
ETHNIC VARIABLES:											
ENG. LANG.	1	1.000	-.993	.037	-.029	-.020	.006	-.038	.075	.077	.026
FR. LANG.	2		1.000	-.067	.028	.019	-.006	.039	-.077	-.026	-.077
NATIVITY	3			1.000	.058	.036*	.007	-.027	.034	.057	.019
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:											
EDUC	4				1.000	-.147	.049	-.060	.120	.742	.277
AGE	5					1.000	-.018	-.179	-.210	-.018	-.066
SEX	6						1.000	.032	.014	.192	.308
FAMS	7							1.000	-.292	-.098	-.093
HOB	8								1.000	.127	.119
SES	9									1.000	.513
OCC	10										1.000
X		15.3	84.5	2.1	4.139	35.101	49.5	3.207	47.6	2.156	1.349
S.D.					2.260	13.960		1.348		-.134	.952

* With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-5

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES FOR THE SAMPLE OF THE N.E. EUROPEAN ETHNIC GROUP

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
ETHNIC VARIABLES:											
ENG. LANG.	1	1.000	-.367	-.298	.040	-.134	.026*	.004	.040	.067	.075
FR. LANG.	1		1.000	.033	.031	-.003*	.006*	.006	.010	.029	.020
NATIVITY	3			1.000	.081	.285	-.002*	.008*	-.056	.080	.036
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:											
EDUC	4				1.000	-.079	.062	-.080	.147	.727	.541
AGE	5					1.000	.000	-.156	-.284	.057	-.003
SEX	6						1.000	.026	-.004	.226	.361
FAMS	7							1.000	-.228	-.076	-.078
MOB	8								1.000	.119	.100
SES	9									1.000	.419
OCC	10										1.000
X		80.8	1.3	28.9	4.629	36.918	51.1	3.123	49.7	.140	2.456
S.D.					2.341	14.306		1.340		1.041	1.156

* With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-6

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES FOR THE SAMPLE OF THE S.E. EUROPEAN ETHNIC GROUP

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
ETHNIC VARIABLES:											
ENG. LANG.	1	1.000	-.182	-.539	.225	-.183	.024	-.102	.082	.262	.069
FR. LANG.	2		1.000	-.016	.031	-.005*	.024	-.016	.021	.032	-.007
NATIVITY	3			1.000	-.160	.257	.020	.079	-.005*	-.155	.010
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:											
EDUC	4				1.000	-.200	.066	-.100	.160	.758	.210
AGE	5					1.000	.023	-.196	-.235	-.076	-.061*
SEX	6						1.000	.014	.002*	.220	.291
FAMS	7							1.000	-.198	-.121	-.062*
MOB	8								1.000	.150	.101
SES	9									1.000	.426
OCC	10										1.000
X		60.8	2.1	50.3	3.992	37.411	51.7	3.241	44.0	-.118	2.428
S.D.					2.621	14.199		1.304		.950	1.178

* With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE 8-7

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES FOR THE SAMPLE OF THE NON-EUROPEAN ETHNIC GROUP

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
ETHNIC VARIABLES:											
ENG. LANG.	1	1.000	-.250	-.389	.032	-.098	.006*	-.037	-.090	.089	.071
FR. LANG.	2		1.000	.017	.033	.004	.019	-.030	.023	.029	.011*
NATIVITY	3			1.000	.214	.127	.000*	-.005	.181	.173	.082
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:											
EDUC	4				1.000	.004	.083	-.106	.120	.794	.278*
AGE	5					1.000	-.005*	-.099	-.184	.088	-.002
SEX	6						1.000	-.001*	-.021	.190	.245
FAMS	7							1.000	-.201	-.098	-.088
MOB	8								1.000	.074	.054
SES	9									1.000	.468
OCC	10										1.000
X		62.8	3.6	54.1	4.694	34.247	50.5	3.208	61.2	.050	2.346
S.D.					2.692	13.142		1.421		1.059	1.239

* With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-8

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES FOR THE SAMPLE WITH MULTIPLE IDENTITY

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
ETHNIC VARIABLES:											
ENG. LANG.	1	1.000	-.898	-.071	.012	-.066	.011*	.011*	.013*	.021*	.042
FR. LANG.	2		1.000	.014*	.000	.050	-.008*	-.010*	-.008*	.010*	-.042
NATIVITY	3			1.000	.096	.084	-.015	-.008*	.035	.078	.002*
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:											
EDUC	4				1.000	.117	.009	-.178	.128	.752	.260
AGE	5					1.000	.024*	-.195	-.111	.238	-.002
SEX	6						1.000	.018	-.018	.129	.213
FAMS	7							1.000	-.310	-.202	-.159
MOB	8								1.000	.137	.103
SES	9									1.000	.442
OCC	10										1.000
X		95.6	3.6	7.4	4.866	30.396	48.2	3.182	55.8	.123	2.434
S.D.					2.049	12.571		1.403		1.005	1.174

* With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-9

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES INCLUDED FOR ANALYSES OF TORONTO C.M.A.

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.167	-.266	-.483	-.396	.044	.031	-.012	-.099	-.008	-.012	-.099[a]	-.008	.041	.074	-.810
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.055	-.092	-.076	-.007	-.017	-.015	-.034	.043	-.015	-.034	.043[a]	-.002	-.004	.798
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.158	-.129	.092	.038	.004	-.014	-.025	.004	-.014	-.025	.027	.100	.598
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.219	-.216	.021	.024	.134	-.104	.024	.134	-.104	.050	-.184	.796
MULT ID	5					1.000	.087	-.034	-.004	.023	.112	-.004	.023	.112	.036	.015	.508
ENG.LANG.	6						1.000	-.169	-.464	.180	-.100	.001	-.108[a]	.020	-.091	.184	-.297
FR. LANG.	7							1.000	-.024	.022	-.007	.001	-.005	.027	.009[a]	.019	.208
NATIVITY	8								1.000	-.081	.181	.007	.083	.040	.088	-.072	.196
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
EDUC	9									1.000	-.077	.074	-.127	.146	-.127	.813	.007
AGE	10										1.000	-.001	-.158	-.221	.044	.093	.040[a]
SEX	11											1.000	.031	.003	.090	.209	.002[a]
PAM	12												1.000	-.236	.025	-.139	-.019[a]
MOB	13													1.000	-.002	.108	.014[a]
MAN	14														1.000	-.124	.033[a]
SES	15															1.000	.009[a]
MIN	16																1.000
X		46.6	3.1	8.5	21.1	5.5	80.4	0.7	43.3	4.713	36.030	56.7	3.019	51.7	19.9	.184	38.2
STD DEV										2.290	13.961		1.347			1.068	

[a]With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-10

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES INCLUDED FOR ANALYSES OF MONTREAL C.M.A.

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.501	-.073	-.117	-.087	.556	-.418	-.014	.069	.034	-.014	-.031	.014	-.001	.365	-.907
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.293	-.466	-.349	-.596	.814	-.535	-.080	.043*	-.015	-.039	.026	-.065	-.066	.549
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.068	-.051	.281	-.248	.132	.099	.048	.004	-.007*	-.034	.002	.103	.683
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.081	.040	-.462	.437	-.098	.027*	.021	.093	-.057	.087	-.082	.432*
MULT ID	5					1.000	.079	-.239	-.400	.082	-.014	.017	.007	.070	.029	.043	.697
ENG. LANG.	6						1.000	-.774	.136	.150	.015	-.007	-.015*	-.028*	.000	.134	-.573
FR. LANG.	7							1.000	-.477	-.067	-.050	.006	-.039	.040*	-.067	-.054	.442
NATIVITY	8								1.000	.021	.115	.027	.043	.031	.098	.021	-.007
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
EDUC	9									1.000	-.153	.087	-.056	.095	-.162	.829	-.088
AGE	10										1.000	-.018	-.177	-.220	.022	.019	-.021
SEX	11											1.000	.031	.001	.068	.220	.022
FAM	12												1.000	-.255	.023	-.087	-.041
MOB	13													1.000	-.004	.078	.009*
MAN	14														1.000	-.176	.004*
SES	15															1.000	-.088
MIN	16																1.000
X		11.2	66.7	4.1	9.8	2.5	21.3	68.9	18.0	4.509	35.973	49.0	2.933	52.2	17.8	.047	
STD DEV										2.250	14.073		1.334			1.054	

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-11

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES INCLUDED FOR ANALYSES OF VANCOUVER C.M.A.

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.189	-.364	-.308	-.455	.356	-.055	-.252	.026	.056*	-.004	-.094	-.022*	-.044	.058	-.899
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.074	-.062	-.092	-.014	.267	-.091	-.029	-.016	-.014	-.035	.032	-.007	-.026	.558
S.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.120	-.177	.050	-.019	.046	.004	.030*	.009	-.003*	-.031	.009	.010	.722
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.150	-.119	-.020	.089	-.091	.037	.010	.033	-.060*	.027	-.073	.636*
MULT ID	5					1.000	-.453	-.023	.358	.008	-.043	.004	.114	.062	.048	-.036	.702
ENG. LANG.	6						1.000	-.185	-.466	.087	-.055	-.004	-.103	-.041	-.079	.112	-.485
FR. LANG.	7							1.000	-.004	.013	.004	.002	-.003	.012	-.020	.002	.070
NATIVITY	8								1.000	.021	.133	.025	.090	.037	.052	.014	.442
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
EDUC	9									1.000	-.053	-.086	-.086	.122	-.110	.796	-.058
AGE	10										1.000	-.021	-.140	-.237	.017	.087	.016
SEX	11											1.000	.024	.024	.010	.127	.020
FAM	12												1.000	-.233	.022	-.088	.109
MOB	13													1.000	-.014	.088	-.007*
MAN	14														1.000	-.111	.055
SES	15															1.000	-.088
MIN	16																1.000
X		48.3	3.7	12.4	9.2	8.3	87.4	0.5	31.9	4.889	36.350	49.7	2.835	56.9	12.2	.241	
STD DEV										2.196	14.093		1.369			1.027	

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-12

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES INCLUDED FOR ANALYSES OF OTTAWA C.M.A.

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.613	-.186	-.195	-.204	.571	-.503	-.063	.113	.073	-.007	-.058	-.013	-.020	.117	-.868
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.182	-.191	-.200	-.676	.789	-.299	-.187	-.042*	-.006	.038	-.013	.017	-.168	.692
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.058	-.061	.137	-.148	.120	.096	.012	.010	.006	.003	-.003	.088	.624
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.064	-.035	-.153	.291	-.041	.031*	.009	.021	-.031	.015	-.030	.732
MULT ID	5					1.000	-.034	-.141	.394*	.066	-.014	.004	.013	.067	.000	.039	.699
ENG. LANG.	6						1.000	-.888	.014	.183	.005	.014	-.076	.033	-.027	.171	-.617
FR. LANG.	7							1.000	-.244	-.160	-.027	-.012	.049	-.039	.021	-.143	.544
NATIVITY	8								1.000	.097	.117	-.010	.024	.027	.011	.084	.100
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
EDUC	9									1.000	-.001	.106	-.093	.110	-.064	.840	-.108
AGE	10										1.000	-.014	-.150	-.229	.007	.149	-.014*
SEX	11											1.000	.023	-.005	.100	.239	.028
FAM	12												1.000	-.268	.005	-.109	.045
MOB	13													1.000	-.010	.082	.018*
MAN	14														1.000	-.055	.027*
SES	15															1.000	-.104
MIN	16																1.000
X		38.5	37.5	5.2	5.7	7.8	62.6	32.4	16.2	5.031	35.504	48.9	2.979	53.1	5.2	.308	
STD DEV										2.368	13.874		1.355			1.136	

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-13

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES INCLUDED FOR ANALYSES OF EDMONTON C.M.A.

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.227	-.348	-.353	-.304	.253	-.099	-.133	.022	.002	.010	-.052	.021	-.001	.038	-.847
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.125	-.127	-.109	-.100	.399	-.130*	-.046	-.035*	.007	-.025	.041	-.009	-.042	.692*
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.194	-.167	.045	-.048	.058	-.014	.028	.009*	.027	-.037*	-.003	-.004	.715
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.170	-.074	-.055	.022	-.048	.079	.000	.011	-.107	.002	-.025	.718
MULT ID	5					1.000	-.291	-.039	.304	.042	-.019*	-.008	.040	.080	.023	.007	.528*
ENG. LANG.	6						1.000	-.403	-.415	.044	-.099	.001	-.037	-.037	-.049	.866	-.277
FR. LANG.	7							1.000	-.050	-.002	.002	.020	-.014	-.040	.001	-.011	.105
NATIVITY	8								1.000	.041	.184	.005	.089	.021	.041	.032	.188
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
EDUC	9									1.000	-.010	.051	-.080	.074	-.068	.802	-.037
AGE	10										1.000	-.006	-.024	-.313	-.004	.144	.056
SEX	11											1.000	-.021	.006	.122	.200	.010
PAM	12												1.000	-.277	-.084	-.077	.049
MOB	13													1.000	-.018	.049	-.040
MAM	14														1.000	-.072	.010
SES	15															1.000	-.038
MIN	16																1.000
X		38.8	7.5	16.0	16.5	8.4	90.0	1.8	21.1	4.832	33.514	51.2	2.813	63.4	9.1	.254	
STD DEV										2.157	13.287		1.379			1.023	

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-14

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES INCLUDED FOR ANALYSIS OF CALGARY C.M.A.

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.229	-.414	-.319	-.374	.296	-.093	-.210	.012	-.027	-.012	-.046	-.003	-.015	.033	-.048
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.098	-.075	-.088	-.082	.359	-.096	-.026	-.042	.016	-.041	.064	.027	-.032	.474*
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.136	-.160	.044	-.042	.035	-.004	.029	-.002*	-.002	-.040	-.019	.013	.692
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.123	-.145	-.035	.113	-.056	.063	.007*	.030	-.048	.004	-.035	.738
MULT ID	5					1.000	-.338	-.015	.327	.021	-.013	.008	.056	.054	.022	-.021	.541*
ENG. LANG.	6						1.000	-.347	-.415	.071	.050*	-.002	-.062	-.034	-.033	.095	-.328
FR. LANG.	7							1.000	-.026	-.020	-.017	.009	-.024	.042	.008	-.038	.099
NATIVITY	8								1.000	-.006	.175	.009	.111	.006	.024	-.010	.270
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
EDUC	9									1.000	-.015	.092	-.089	.104	-.071	.791	-.027*
AGE	10										1.000	-.009	.057	.077	-.308	.205	.025*
SEX	11											1.000	-.023	.024	.107	.236	.022*
FAM	12												1.000	-.260	-.018	-.068	.035
MOB	13													1.000	.004	.059	.004*
MAN	14														1.000	-.077	.017*
SES	15															1.000	-.036*
MIN	16																1.000
X		49.2	5.1	15.0	9.5	8.6	91.2	1.5	23.2	5.035	33.435	51.6	2.746	67.3	8.4	.343	
STD DEV										2.212	13.027		1.389			1.069	

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-15

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES INCLUDED FOR ANALYSES OF WINNIPEG C.M.A.

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.237	-.336	-.351	-.280	.264	-.121	-.133	.041	.038*	.011	-.027	-.016	-.080	.053	-.863
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.147	-.153	-.122	-.155	.483	-.138	-.059	-.042	-.018	.033	.037	-.010	-.053	.726
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.218	-.174	.042	-.075	-.056	.028	.040*	.008	-.004	-.037	-.018	.044	.629
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.181	-.140	-.079	.066	-.086	.098*	.009	-.024	-.078	.047	-.058	.709
MULT ID	5					1.000	-.164	-.039	.243*	.028	-.086	-.015	.033	.106	.109	-.026	.620
ENG. LANG.	6						1.000	-.460	-.401	.084*	-.105	.022	-.030	-.012	-.123	.103	-.286
FR. LANG.	7							1.000	-.056	-.008	.029	-.013	.025	.000	-.009	-.005	.135
NATIVITY	8								1.000	-.014	.140	-.012	.040	.028	.158	-.029	.181
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
EDUC	9									1.000	-.094	.060	-.064	.102	-.128	.828	-.052
AGE	10										1.000	-.094	-.202	-.198	.009	.044	.032
SEX	11											1.000	.030	-.010	.100	.185	-.001*
PAN	12												1.000	-.231	-.021	-.006	.023*
MOB	13													1.000	.032	.064	-.001*
MAN	14														1.000	-.152	.090*
SES	15															1.000	-.050*
MIN	16																1.000
X		35.1	9.4	17.3	18.5	7.1	88.1	2.8	20.0	4.614	35.847	48.6	2.941	38.7	6.8	.005	
STD DEV										2.202	14.574		1.357			.971	

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-16

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES INCLUDED FOR ANALYSES OF QSEESEC C.M.A.

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.699	-.012	-.013	-.020	.302	-.242	.046	.029	-.009	.017	-.024	.027	-.015	.026	-.927
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.241	-.262	-.405	-.308	.477	-.287	-.069	-.001	-.019	.018	-.053	.016	-.061	.794
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.005	-.007	.085	-.098	.102	.049	-.005	.009	-.018	.018	.013	.049	.015*
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.008	.022	-.097	.185	-.008	.003	-.002	.001	.012	-.023	.018	.016*
MULT ID	5					1.000	-.098	-.238	.403	.046	-.002	.009	.002	.039	.003	.028	.024*
ENG. LANG.	6						1.000	-.828	.137	.040	.011	-.001	-.012	.001	-.007	.015	-.295
FR. LANG.	7							1.000	-.268	-.037	-.036	-.002	.010	-.005	.005	-.016	.262
NATIVITY	8								1.000	.068	.017	.022	.007	.023	-.011	.055	-.031
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
EDUC	9									1.000	-.182	.116	-.050	.143	-.123	.833	-.033
AGE	10										1.000	-.032	-.150	-.218	.020	-.009	.006*
SEX	11											1.000	.037	-.018	.091	.242	-.013*
FAM	12												1.000	-.329	.023	-.096	.035
MOB	13													1.000	-.025	.130	-.036
MAN	14														1.000	-.135	.021*
SES	15															1.000	-.034*
MIN	16																1.000
X		3.4	93.3	0.4	0.5	2.2	2.6	96.3	2.4	4.617	35.437	48.6	3.041	46.2	7.8	.098	
STD DEV										2.202	13.719		1.352			1.063	

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-17

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES INCLUDED FOR ANALYSES OF HAMILTON C.M.A.

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.240	-.342	-.535	-.295	.394	-.100	-.260	.039	.029	-.026	-.002*	.019*	-.022	.049	-.880
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.065	-.102	-.056	-.036	.358	-.123	-.040	-.034	-.006	-.039	.056	-.004	-.035	.668
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.146	-.080	-.002	-.028	.125	.036	.021	-.012	.019*	-.021	-.032	.034	.642
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.126	-.441	-.033	.293	-.130	.043	.035	.066	-.081	.071	-.112	.611
MULT ID	5					1.000	-.112	-.006	.145	.071	-.021*	-.001	-.007	.049	-.086	.048	.737
ENG. LANG.	6						1.000	-.257	-.404	.161	-.114*	.009	-.048	.054*	-.073	.145	-.418
FR. LANG.	7							1.060	-.044	-.017	.000	-.004	-.007	.028	-.018	-.013	.099
NATIVITY	8								1.000	-.061	.233	.001	.044	-.044	.085	-.025	.330
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
EDUC	9									1.000	-.095	.061	-.056	.106	-.111	.017	-.057
AGE	10										1.000	-.014	-.219	-.254	.060	.070	.019*
SEX	11											1.000	.034	-.004	.249	.213	-.028*
FAM	12												1.000	-.223	-.223	-.003	.049
MOB	13													1.000	-.032	.091	-.029
MAN	14														1.000	-.007	.040
SES	15															1.000	-.066
MIN	16																1.000
X		55.7	0.4	8.5	18.5	6.4	88.7	0.8	29.9	4.424	36.668	48.7	3.125	45.1	25.8	.819	
STD DEV										2.090	14.534		1.296			.975	

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-18

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES INCLUDED FOR ANALYSES OF LONDON C.M.A.

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.267	-.435	-.437	-.329	.346	-.051	-.293	-.005	.069	-.004	-.049	-.028	-.024	.023	-.816
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.069	-.070	-.052	.002	.203	-.088	-.009	-.018*	.023	-.006	.044	.008	-.003	.692
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.113	-.085	.023	-.020	.130	.051	-.008	.000	.007	-.051	-.007	.035	.536
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.086	-.441	-.020	.288	-.086	.074*	-.005	.053	-.009	.015	-.061	.720
MOLT ID	5					1.000	-.208	-.015	.235	.027	-.018	-.004	.004	.051	.026	-.007	.728
ENG. LANG.	6						1.000	-.217	-.399	.116	-.062	-.005	-.075	.013*	-.052	.108	-.292
FR. LANG.	7							1.000	-.021	-.031	.010	.019	.004*	.031*	.008	-.020	.069
NATIVITY	8								1.000	-.035	.146	.007	.066	-.042	.030	-.025	.321
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
EDUC	9									1.000	-.094	.066	-.101	.135	-.100	.803	-.021
AGE	10										1.000	-.016	-.166	-.267	.026	.078	.062*
SEX	11											1.000	.045	.000	.127	.199	.030*
PAM	12												1.000	-.236	.016	-.102	.041
MOB	13													1.000	-.929	.070	-.011
MAN	14														1.000	-.118	.020
SES	15															1.000	-.012*
MIN	16																1.000
X		62.7	4.1	10.1	10.2	6.8	93.0	0.4	21.9	4.691	35.890	48.4	2.988	52.7	16.0	.130	
STD DEV										2.156	14.353		1.313			1.005	

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-19

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES INCLUDED FOR ANALYSES OF ST. CATHERINES C.M.A.

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.306	-.334	-.491	-.227	.337	-.158	-.200	.056	.010	-.031	-.051	.068	-.040	.051	-.082
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.106	-.156	-.072	-.185	.499	-.157	-.087	-.020	-.010	-.019	.017	.037	-.083	.631
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.170	-.079	.013	-.057	.129	.031	.018*	.006	.032	-.013	-.018	.020	.579
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.282	-.084	.277	-.116	-.099	.064	.023	.028	-.103	.050	-.057	.772
MULT ID	5					1.000	-.079	-.032	.108	.083	.005	.016	.005	.019	-.010	.069	.659
ENG. LANG.	6						1.000	-.483	-.329	.162	-.156*	.010	.016*	.048	-.032	.127	-.356
FR. LANG.	7							1.000	-.082	-.078	.047	-.004	-.004*	.007	.007	-.073	.141
NATIVITY	8								1.000	-.019	.242	-.007	.032	-.062	.048	.029	.257
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
EDUC	9									1.000	-.121	.077	-.009	.087	-.128	.814	-.065
AGE	10										1.000	-.019	-.281	-.218	.125	.052	.053
SEX	11											1.000	.032	-.014	.259	.249	.032
PAM	12												1.000	-.195	-.037	-.047	.038
MOB	13													1.000	-.014	.057	-.078
MAN	14														1.000	-.059	.054
SES	15															1.000	-.056
MIN	16																1.000
X		49.0	8.9	10.4	20.0	6.6	89.3	2.7	23.4	4.220	36.636	49.1	3.213	42.7	22.8	-.112	
STD DEV										1.968	14.576		1.283			.988	

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-20

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES INCLUDED FOR ANALYSES OF KITCHENER C.M.A.

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.198	-.506	-.345	-.262	-.325	-.079	-.197	.050	-.024*	-.005	.001	-.019	-.025	-.010	-.866
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.115	-.070	-.060	-.024	.355	-.099	-.041	-.017*	-.028	-.032	.021	.017	-.038	.626
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.200	-.152	.019	-.039	-.017	-.032	.102	.017	-.012	-.019*	.049	.037	.581
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.104	-.396	-.031	.317	-.097	.017	.004	.016	-.004	-.018	.021	.702
MULT ID	5					1.000	-.205	-.012	.218	.054	-.033	.003	.005	.029	-.014	.006	.633
ENG. LANG.	6						1.000	-.239	-.465	.141	-.112*	-.006	.011	-.022	.019*	-.013	-.360
FR. LANG.	7							1.000	-.029	-.004	.002	.000	-.033	.029	-.026*	.013	.077
NATIVITY	8								1.000	-.024	.177	.003	-.019	.040	.011	.146	.275
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
EDUC	9									1.000	-.082	.084	-.099	.166	-.058	.038	-.082
AGE	10										1.000	-.021	-.136	-.261	.035	.092	.056
SEX	11											1.000	.015	.002	.163	.212	.017*
FAM	12												1.000	-.218	-.009	-.062	-.009*
MOB	13													1.000	.034	.057	-.030*
MAN	14														1.000	-.166	.062
SES	15															1.000	-.036
MIN	16																1.000
X		46.6	4.3	22.7	12.0	7.1	88.8	0.7	25.7	4.446	35.413	49.8	3.213	52.7	16.8	.017	
STD DEV										2.137	14.046		1.283			.984	

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically sigaificant at .01 level.

TABLE B-21

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES INCLUDED FOR ANALYSES OF HALIFAX C.M.A.

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.473	-.397	-.189	-.337	-.142	.265	-.173	-.022	.009*	.017	.006	.034	-.038	.062	-.053
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.085	-.040	-.072	-.050	-.198	.332	-.056	.007	.012	-.026	.033	.014	-.038	.650
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	-.034	-.060	.067	.005	-.034	.024	.060*	.001*	-.011	-.108	-.018	-.012	.730
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	-.029	.194	-.156	.000	.010	.015	.002	.015	.029	.001	-.009	.660
MULT ID	5					1.000	.249	-.160	-.010	.034	-.017	-.024	.002	.041	.022	.001	.537
ENG. LANG.	6						1.000	-.679	-.234	-.020	-.027	-.022*	.002	-.022	-.117	.141	-.396
FR. LANG.	7							1.000	-.001	.013	-.007	.012	-.009	-.015	.007	-.008	.061
NATIVITY	8								1.000	.134	.112	.014	.020	.003	.110	-.028	-.050
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
EDUC	9									1.000	-.052	.007	-.072	.109	-.178	.028	.018
AGE	10										1.000	.014	-.158	-.283	.037	.074	.012*
SEX	11											1.000	.049	-.027	.098	.161	.101
FAM	12												1.000	-.271	-.002	-.118	-.007*
MOB	13													1.000	-.018	.150	.062
MAN	14														1.000	.043	-.014
SES	15															1.000	.000
MIR	16																1.000
X		1.6	68.9	9.2	6.6	13.7	8.1	96.6	8.1	4.833	34.679	49.3	3.002	51.1	6.0	.149	
STD DEV										2.245	13.626		1.369			.998	

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.

TABLE B-22

ZERO ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES INCLUDED IN THE AGGREGATE ANALYSES

VARIABLES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ETHNIC VARIABLES:																	
BRITISH	1	1.000	-.864*	.430*	.199	.197	.462*	.893*	-.883	-.742*	.333	-.989*	.196	-.036	-.128	.095	-.081
FRENCH	2		1.000	-.626*	-.549	-.544*	.529*	-.973*	.942*	-.801*	-.556*	.876*	-.188	-.059	.047	-.188	.095
N.W. EUR	3			1.000	.518*	.484*	.252*	.691*	-.680	.352*	.429*	.534*	.171	-.028	-.110	.090	-.027
S.E. EUR	4				1.000	.341*	-.036	.415*	-.421*	.657*	.695*	.675*	.076	-.167	-.012	.586	-.132
OTHERS	5					1.000	.423*	.460*	-.466*	.602*	.533*	-.250	.277*	.386*	.136*	-.073	-.194
MULTIP ID	6						1.000	.634*	-.602*	-.502*	-.183	588	.318*	.518*	.302*	.257	.251*
ENGLISH	7							1.000	-.899*	-.702*	.368*	-.920	.196	-.111	.027	.072	-.111
FRENCH	8								1.000	-.790	.212	.871*	-.190	-.106	.011	.042	.098
OTHERS	9									1.000	.321	.205	-.029	-.101	-.020	.062	.062
NATIVITY	10										1.000	-.274	.051	-.285*	-.038	.490	.199
MINORITY	11											1.000	-.118	-.053	.067	-.044	.116
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:																	
SEX	12												1.000	.188	.490	-.118*	.007
MOB	13													1.000	.375	-.145	.403*
FAM	14														1.000	-.033*	-.236*
MANF	15															1.000	-.108
SOCIOECO	16																1.000
X		42.120	20.948	10.440	12.332	8.743	5.406	73.960	20.948	05.900	23.635	52.463	49.329	48.069	39.632	17.937	1.696
STD DEV		18.274	28.690	5.731	7.475	5.267	3.329	29.056	28.690	28.292	13.425	28.030	2.336	20.115	20.038	9.613	.193

*With the exception of the coefficients in asterisks, all others are statistically significant at .01 level.