The Role of Multiculturalism Policy in Addressing Social Inclusion Processes in Canada

Ilene Hyman
Centre for Voluntary Sector Studies, Ryerson University
Agnes Meinhard
Centre for Voluntary Sector Studies, Ryerson University
John Shields
Department of Politics and School of Public Administration, Ryerson University

Working paper series
Volume 2011 (3)

350 Victoria Street
Toronto, Ontario M5B 2K3
Tel: 416-979-5146 x 6739 / Fax: 416-979-5124
cvss@ryerson.ca
http://www.ryerson.ca/cvss/working_papers

Introduction

As we approach the 40th anniversary of Canada's multiculturalism policy, the concept of multiculturalism is under attack in many jurisdictions. The leaders of Germany, France and Britain, have each declared that multiculturalism has been a failure in their countries, serving to separate and segregate, rather than integrate (Edmonton Journal, February 13, 2011). It seems timely therefore, to briefly review the origins and evolution of Canada's multiculturalism policy and examine future directions in light of the changing global and national situation, and newly emerging public discourses on integration, inclusion and the meaning of Canadian identity.

The focus of this paper is on the role multiculturalism policy plays in creating a more inclusionary society in the twenty-first century in Canada. We set the context by presenting a brief historical overview of multiculturalism policy since its introduction in 1971 and summarizing some of the recent Canadian discourse surrounding multiculturalism. One of the key questions we explore is whether multiculturalism policy should move beyond focusing on the integration of population groups marginalized by national, racial, religious or ethnic origins, to addressing broader social inclusionary processes that influence inequities and impact on nation building as a whole.

The rest of the paper examines two such processes. In the first case we examine the process of racism and discuss the role that multiculturalism policy may play in addressing racism by removing systemic barriers that impede full participation in Canadian society. In the second case we examine the process of collective social capital as a facilitator of inclusion and shared identity and discuss how multiculturalism policy can support its development. The paper concludes that multiculturalism policy needs to take a leadership role in developing, and implementing national social inclusion policies to reduce social exclusion and ensure the full and valued participation of all Canadians (i.e. "inclusive citizenship").

Since many of the concepts we discuss in this paper are complex constructs that are debated in the literature, we provide some working definitions at the outset.

Definitions

Multiculturalism

The concept of multiculturalism is so broad that it often defies definition. It can refer to: a demographic fact describing the co-existence of peoples from different ethno-cultural backgrounds in a single society or organization; an ideological aspiration celebrating diversity, a set of policies aimed at managing diversity; or a process by which ethnic and racial groups leverage support to achieve their aspirations (Dewing and Leman, 2006). It is a term that has recently taken on negative connotations, being seen as a divisive force rather than as a platform for mutual benefit and co-existence. In Canada, multiculturalism most often refers to a set of ideas and ideals celebrating our nation's cultural diversity. At the policy level it refers to the "management of diversity through formal initiatives in the federal provincial and municipal domains" (Dewing and Leman, 2006: 1).

In this paper, our use of multiculturalism refers to "a system of beliefs and behaviours that recognizes and respects the presence of all diverse groups in an organization or society, acknowledges and values their socio-cultural differences, and encourages and enables their continued contribution within an inclusive cultural context which empowers all within the organization or society" (Rosado,1996:2). The first part of this definition covers the ideological aspect of multiculturalism while the second part of the definition refers to enabling which implies that there must be policy to ensure that everyone can contribute. The definition also implies that society as a whole benefits when it is inclusive, a theme we focus on this paper. Thus multiculturalism is a platform that allows all Canadians to be part of the building of our nation. In order for it to be successful, it must be supported by strong policies that enable ALL groups to participate equitably.

Integration

Integration is a broad term that is typically used to describe the settlement experiences and participation of immigrants in the country of adoption. Integration may encompass many different dimensions: economic integration into the labour market; political (or civic) integration into the electoral process and other forms of political participation; and, social integration into the networks and spaces of civil society, from informal networks of friends and neighbours to membership in more formal organizations (Kymlicka, 2010: 7). The literature describes integration as a two-way interactional process between a host society and "immigrants" (regardless of generation) that is influenced both by institutional structures and societal attitudes on the one hand, and migration factors such as human capital and collective social capital on the other (Frideres, 2008). Immigrants may be well integrated in one domain of life, e.g., employment, but poorly integrated in other domains e.g., social and political, during different stages of the resettlement process. Typically, the term 'settlement' is used to describe the provision of: a) immediate needs such as shelter, food, clothing, information and orientation, basic language instruction, and other essential "reception" or early settlement services and b) intermediate needs such as employment-specific language instruction, upgrading skills through education and training, access to health services, housing, and the legal system. Long-term integration goals include the removal of systemic barriers, full participation in Canadian society, and citizenship (Mwarigha, 2002).

Social Exclusion.

The formal concept of social exclusion originated in France in the 1970s where it emerged as a response to the erosion of the welfare state, downward economic shifts, and increasing population diversity (Ebersold, 1998). The notion of social exclusion gained prominence when large segments of the population were excluded from the labour market. This contributed homelessness, alarming increases in child poverty, and elevated rates of family breakdown (Shields et al., 2006).

Social exclusion, or the "unequal access to critical resources that determine the quality of membership in society, ultimately produces and reproduces a complex of unequal outcomes" (Galabuzi, 2008: 236). As such it may be defined as the inequities in multidimensional outcomes that exist among individuals and across social groups based on their differential access to resources, opportunities for participation and power. Although the contemporary discourse on social exclusion focuses largely on poverty and labour force participation, other dimensions of social exclusion in Canada have been identified: economic, health, political/civic, socio-cultural and transportation (Hyman et al., in press).

Social Inclusion

Social inclusion is considered by many to be a normative, values-based concept identifying the type of society we want to live in and the changes needed to build that society (O'Hara et al., 2006). Sen (2001:74) defines an inclusive society "characterized by a widely shared social experience and active participation, by a broad equality of opportunities and life chances for individuals and by the achievement of a basic level of well-being for all citizens". The removal of barriers is critical for full participation. Social inclusion may be conceptualized in terms of the processes (i.e., policies and conditions) that contribute to observed inequities. This differentiation of social inclusion in terms of processes and social exclusion in terms of outcomes is consistent with the emerging consensus in recent literature that the analysis of social exclusion should include not only the outcomes but the processes that produce inequities (Galabuzi, 2008; Patychuk & Hyman, 2009; Saloojee, 2001). Thus, it is important, for example, in a country perspective, to consider "how policies/actions address the complex and dynamic relational processes that generate social exclusion and ultimately impact on individual and population health and well-being" (Popay et al., 2006). However, there has been no coherent work to date on social inclusion in Canada. Building on the work of Shookner (2000), Health Canada (2002) proposed that social inclusion frameworks adopt eight elements or dimensions: cultural, economic, functional, participatory, physical, political, relational and structural with elements of exclusion encompassing constructs such as disadvantage, poverty, disability, marginalization, barriers, denial of human rights, isolation and discrimination. Non-government organizations such as the Laidlaw Foundation and the Roeher Institute have also been involved in the conceptualization of social inclusion. There is a general recognition that the responsibility for social inclusion rests with public and private institutions and with individuals.

Brief History of Multiculturalism Policy in Canada

In 1971, the federal government recognized multiculturalism as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society through the adoption of a formal multiculturalism policy. The policy recognized the contribution to the nation of the many ethno-cultural groups, besides the French and the British, who had made Canada their home. It encouraged a vision of Canada based on the values of equality and mutual respect with regard to race, national or ethnic origin,

colour and religion. The 1971 Multiculturalism Policy of Canada also confirmed the rights of Aboriginal peoples and the status of Canada's two official languages (Kymlicka, 2010).

The stated objectives of the 1971 Multiculturalism Policy were to:

- recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society and acknowledges the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage;
- recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of the Canadian heritage and identity and that it provides an invaluable resource in the shaping of Canada's future;
- promote the full and equitable participation of individuals and communities of all origins in the continuing evolution and shaping of all aspects of Canadian society and assist them in the elimination of any barrier to such participation;
- recognize the existence of communities whose members share a common origin and their historic contribution to Canadian society, and enhance their development;
- ensure that all individuals receive equal treatment and equal protection under the law, while respecting and valuing their diversity;
- encourage and assist the social, cultural, economic and political institutions of Canada to be respectful and inclusive of Canada's multicultural character;
- promote the understanding and creativity that arise from the interaction between individuals and communities of different origins;
- foster the recognition and appreciation of the diverse cultures of Canadian society and promote the reflection and the evolving expressions of those cultures;
- preserve and enhance the use of languages other than English and French, while strengthening the status and use of the official languages of Canada;
- advance multiculturalism throughout Canada in harmony with the national commitment to the official languages of Canada (Department of Justice, 1985).

By 1981, as Canada's racial diversity was beginning to grow, more attention was being devoted to racial discrimination, and a special unit for race relations was formed. In 1982, with the repatriation of the Canadian constitution, multicultural policies were firmly entrenched in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, guaranteeing among others, equal protection and benefit of the law, and freedom from discrimination on the basis of gender, religion and racial or ethnic origin. When the multiculturalism policy was first announced in 1971, the Canadian social mosaic was still dominated by persons of European Christian heritage. Its original emphasis was on cultural retention and cultural sharing and was supported by funding initiatives aimed at the preservation of language and culture (Fleras & Kunz, 2001). As the racial and religious makeup of new immigrants was shifting from mostly European Christian to mostly Asian non-Christian, a growing number of Canada's newcomers found themselves facing the consequences of social exclusion in many spheres of life (Omidvar & Richmond, 2005).

In 1988, Parliament passed the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, which provided a legal framework to guide federal responsibilities and activities with respect to multiculturalism in Canada. The Act went beyond simply guaranteeing equal opportunity for all Canadians, regardless of origin. It emphasized the right of Canada's ethnic, racial and religious minorities to preserve and share their unique cultural heritage and it underlined the need to address race relations and eliminate systemic inequalities. It required all federal institutions to carry out their activities in a manner that is sensitive and responsive to the multicultural reality of Canada and report annually on how their institution met these requirements. It also included a provision for funding to 'mainstream' institutions such as police forces, hospitals and schools to implement multiculturalism policies and programs aimed at reducing barriers to access (Mock, 2002; Kunz & Sykes, 2007; Policy Research Initiative, 2009).

Demographically, much has changed since 1988. According to the 2006 census, 16.5% of the Canadian population identified themselves as belonging to a 'visible minority' group (as defined in the Employment Equity Act). In Toronto and Vancouver, over 40% of the population are 'visible minorities', followed by 22% in Calgary, and 16.5% in Montreal. These demographic changes, occurring as they did during two economic downturns, resulted in a slowing down of the economic integration of newcomers, with an accompanying racialization of poverty (Picot, 2008; Saloojee, 2005). Recessionary economics resulting in government cutbacks to programs aimed at equity further exacerbated the situation. In addition to these economic setbacks, increasing religious diversity in Canada and escalations of racial tension and violence in the wake of 9/11 and other international incidents, have also contributed to the marginalization and social exclusion of certain immigrant groups (Kymlicka, PRI, 2009; Mock, 2002; Kunz & Sykes, 2007).

In summary, the focus of and challenges to multiculturalism policy have evolved over time from celebrating difference in the 1970's, to managing diversity in the 1980's, to constructive engagement in the 1990's (Fleras & Kunz, 2001). The 2009 policy objectives for the Multiculturalism Program focus on building an integrated, socially cohesive society and making institutions more responsive to the needs of Canada's diverse population (Citizenship and Immigration, 2011). These aims are consistent with addressing broader social inclusionary processes that influence inequities and impact on nation building as a whole

Through the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act,* the Government of Canada recognizes the diversity of Canadians as regards race, national or ethnic origin, colour and religion as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society and is committed to a policy of multiculturalism designed to preserve and enhance the multicultural heritage of Canadians and equality of opportunity in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada. Under the Act, all federal institutions shall: ensure that Canadians of all origins have an equal opportunity to obtain employment and advancement in those institutions; promote policies, programs and practices that enhance the ability of individuals and communities of all origins to contribute to the continuing evolution of Canada; promote policies, programs and practices that enhance the understanding of and respect for the diversity of the members of Canadian society; collect statistical data in order to enable the development of policies, programs and practices that are sensitive and responsive to the multicultural reality of Canada; make use, as appropriate, of the language skills and cultural understanding of individuals of all origins; and, generally, carry on their activities in a manner that is sensitive and responsive to the multicultural reality of Canada.

http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/

Current Debates

From its start, supporters and critics of multiculturalism have debated its role and impact on the integration of immigrants, racial and ethnic groups and religious minorities in Canada. It is difficult to weigh these arguments because they are often based on different conceptions of multiculturalism. We summarize some of the arguments both in favour of and against multiculturalism, bearing in mind that not only are the arguments based on different conceptions of multiculturalism, but some are also influenced by what is happening outside of Canada. Nevertheless, we present these arguments because they are an indication of some of the concerns regarding multiculturalism as a policy.

According to a recent Angus Reid poll, 55% of Canadians thought that our multiculturalism policy has been very good or good and 30% thought it has been bad or very bad. More than half of respondents (54%) believed Canada should be a melting pot, while one third of Canadians (33%) endorsed the concept of the mosaic (Angus Reid, 2010). This is an intriguing contradiction that seems to indicate both an acceptance of the diversity that is characteristic of Canada today, and a desire for all these diverse people to become "Canadian" however that is defined in the mind of the respondent. Indeed, in the minds of the majority of

several hundreds of university undergraduates surveyed over the course of a decade, the defining feature of Canadian culture is multiculturalism.[1]

Supporters of multiculturalism policy argue that multiculturalism policy promotes integration by removing barriers to participation in Canadian life. There is strong evidence that multiculturalism policy has played a positive role in the successful integration of immigrants and ethnic and religious minorities in Canada (as compared to many other countries that lack an official multiculturalism policy) (Kymlicka, 1998; Kymlicka, 2010; CIC, 2008; Banting et al., 2007; Bloemraad, 2006). Among the examples of success provided by Kymlicka, (1998; 2010: 7) were the high level of mutual identification and acceptance among immigrants and native-born Canadians, the high likelihood of immigrants in Canada becoming citizens, high rates intermarriage, high levels of official language proficiency, and the fact that Canadian immigrants are more likely to participate in the political process, as voters, party members, or even candidates for political office than the U.S., Australia, or any European country (Howe 2007). Findings from the OECD (2006) suggest that the children of immigrants have better educational outcomes in Canada than in any other Western democracy. According to a survey conducted by Focus Canada in 2006, 83% of Canadians agree that Muslims make a positive contribution to Canada (Adams, 2009) suggesting that Canada has been less affected by the global surge in anti-Muslim sentiments and by the resulting polarization of ethnic relations experienced in many European countries (Kymlicka, 2010: 7).

Shared identity and sense of belonging are considered to be important indicators of the effectiveness of multiculturalism policy in Western democratic nation-states, such as Canada, where there is no common ethnicity or culture (Bush, 2008; Edwards, 2010). According to data from the 2003 General Social Survey (GSS), 84% of recent immigrants and an even higher proportion of non-recent immigrants, reported a strong sense of belonging to Canada, compared to 85% of the Canadian born population (Statistics Canada, 2003). Data from the 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey (EDS) suggest that Canadians identifying as 'visible minorities' express a stronger sense of belonging than other Canadians (Reitz & Banerjee, 2007). There is evidence that immigrants in Canada, regardless of their religious affiliation, increasingly share Canada's liberal-democratic norms, or what the authors called "Charter values," including the rights of gays and women (Soroka, Johnston & Banting 2007).

Critics, on the other hand, maintain that multiculturalism threatens national cohesion and, contributes to ghettoization (Bissoondath, 1994; 2002; Wong, 2010). In a recent poll, Canadians widely agreed that 'Canada should not promote cultural differences at the expense of shared Canadian values' (PRI, 2009). This of course has never been the objective of Canadian multiculturalism. On the basis of a survey of tensions in other countries, Allan Gregg and others have argued that Canadians have no reason to be complacent, asserting that "as is the case in England, France, and other advanced liberal democracies, national unity in Canada is

[1] This finding comes from an informal survey done yearly by the second author in her undergraduate classes in Toronto. Without priming, students are asked to list three defining features of Canada. Among 75% of the students, multiculturalism ranks first or second.

increasingly threatened by the growing atomization of our society along ethnic lines" (Gregg, 2006: 4; Bennett-Jones, 2005). Some, such as Senator Donald Oliver, believe that these critiques of multiculturalism policy have contributed to the erosion of its funding and mandate over the last couple of decades and its shift in focus to citizenship, identity and race relations at the expense of heritage culture and language preservation (Oliver, 2006).

Multiculturalism policy has also been criticized as a means by which certain social groups are kept in a dependent position through the accentuation of differences, thus entrenching their second-class status and reducing the challenge they pose to the so-called 'dominant' group (Li, 2003; Bannerji, 2000; Henry & Tator, 2006; 1999; Kallen, 1982).

Others maintain that multiculturalism policy can act as a barrier to immigrant integration and social inclusion. According to Hansen & Pikkov (2008), policies centred exclusively on economic and educational integration are more effective than policies, such as multiculturalism, that focus on the preservation of ethnic, cultural or religious identity. There is evidence that some racialized groups are not integrating as successfully as others are (PRI, 2009). Richmond and Saloojee (2005), observe that the recognition of differences that is the core of multiculturalism policy is not the same as valued recognition.

Finally, inclusive citizenship is emerging as a 21st century goal not only for multiculturalism policy but for Canadian social policy as a whole (Richmond & Saloojee, 2005; The Roeher Institute, 2003). Inclusive citizenship is about valued participation, valued recognition and belonging, wherein citizens are nurtured to their fullest capacities. The concept of inclusive citizenship goes beyond the idea of integrating new immigrants into the 'host' society. It implies that while newcomers are being integrated, the rest of Canadian society is also changing to reflect the diversity of the whole - redefining what it means to be Canadian.

However, inclusive citizenship is at risk when a society fails to develop the talents and capacities of all its members (Saloojee, 2001). Unfortunately, Canada has not yet achieved inclusive citizenship, as economic, social, and political inequities that disenfranchise certain groups from full participation still exist.

Racism and Social Exclusion

Perhaps one of the most insidious processes undermining the achievement of inclusive citizenship is racism and the multidimensional forms of social exclusion that results from it. There is evidence that inequities are growing in Canada and that they are increasingly along racialized lines (PRI, 2009).

Racism may be defined as the belief that race is the primary determinant of human traits and capacities, and that racial differences produce an inherent superiority of a particular race (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2008). However, the Canadian Race Relations Foundation defines *racism* not only as an attitude, but also as the specific actions resulting from this attitude that marginalize and oppress certain people (Abella, 1984).

Racism is usually understood in the interpersonal sense—that is, discriminatory interactions, both conscious and unconscious, between individuals (Karlsen & Nazroo, 2002). A

less visible form of racism is systemic or institutional racism. This refers to "the collective failure of an organization or social structure to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture, or ethnic origin…[it]… can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes, and behaviour that amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness, and racist stereotyping which disadvantages people in ethnic minority groups" (Macpherson, 1999: article 6.34).

The concept of "racialization," refers to the social *process* whereby certain groups come to be designated as different and consequently subjected to differential and unequal treatment (Galabuzi, 2004; 2006). Lack of equal access to opportunities, marginalization, and exclusion among ethno-racial groups suggest that their perceived racial membership plays a significant role in shaping their collective experience—that is, they are *racialized*, rather than "merely" *racial*, groups. Unlike the term "visible minorities," which Canada's *Employment Equity Act* defines as "non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour," "racialized groups" makes clear that race is not an objective biological fact, but rather a social and cultural construct that exposes individuals to racism.

The right to equal treatment is a fundamental human right, as outlined in the Canadian Human Rights Act (Department of Justice, 1985). Despite this, there has been a failure, both presently and historically, to fully recognize that racial and religious discrimination persists across all dimensions of Canadian society (CRRF, 2008). Historical examples of discrimination and racism in Canada include the Aboriginal residential school system, the Japanese internment during the Second World War, the denial of Jews to enter Canada during the Nazi persecution, the *Chinese head tax,* the *Oriental Exclusion Act*, the barring of African Canadians to services and employment, discriminatory immigration provisions against African Americans and denial of the vote to Asians and Aboriginal peoples.

Despite the proliferation of methods to measure racism, including surveys and interviews, analysis of secondary data, and social psychological experimentation, there are no sources that regularly collect this information in Canada. Recent research attests to the existence of perceived racism in Canada despite the fact that equal treatment is a fundamental human right.

- Approximately 20% of 'visible minorities', compared with 5% of non –'visible minorities', reported having experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in the five years preceding the survey (Canadian Ethnic Diversity Survey, 2003). Significant differences in experiences and perceptions of racism were noted between dominant groups with European heritage and racialized groups (Reitz & Banerjee, 2007; Nakhaie et al., 2007).
- Immigrants were twice as likely as non-immigrants to experience discrimination (job or promotions, in a store, on the street), and racialized groups were twice as likely as non-racialized groups to experience discrimination (Perrault, 2009), quoting data from the 2004 GSS Survey on Victimization).
- Police reports on hate crimes in 2006 showed that the majority of hate crimes were motivated by race/ethnicity (61%) followed by religion (27%) and sexual orientation (10%). Half of all the racially-motivated crimes targeted people who were in Black racialized groups. Nearly

two-thirds of religiously-motivated hate crimes were directed at the Jewish faith (Dauvergne et al, 2008).

- According to the International Youth Survey, immigrant and second generation youth were significantly more likely than Canadian-born (third or more generation) youth to report that they had been discriminated against at least once in their lifetime because of race, religion or spoken language (Zeman & Bressan, 2006).
- Public opinion polls, student surveys and other research indicate that people of the Islamic faith and those with Muslim or Arab-sounding names experienced significant discrimination beyond the immediate backlash after the events of September 11, 2001 (Kymlicka, 2010; PRI, 2009; Patychuk & Hyman, 2008).

While most people refrain from direct expressions racism, they will often condone, overlook or be patently unaware of the fundamental ways in which society's political, economic and social institutions contribute to social exclusion. These include, for example: the lack of recognition of international credentials; lack of policies to ensure the accessibility (financial, linguistic, cultural, geographic) of public services for all; and lack policies to ensure greater representation in decision making. Systemic institutional racism is evident if we consider the following facts about the experiences of racialized groups in Canada:

- Racialized people are two or three times as likely to be poor than other Canadians (Galabuzi, 2006). According to Pendakur and Pendakur (1998), the earning differential between racialized and non-racialized Canadians is an indicator of economic discrimination.
- Despite higher levels of education, racialized groups in Canada are more likely to be unemployed or employed in precarious work (defined as atypical employment contracts, limited social benefits, poor statutory entitlements, job insecurity, short tenure and low wages) than non-racialized Canadians (Galabuzi, 2006).
- The 2001 unemployment rates for the total labour force, at 6.7%, in comparison to 12.1% for recent immigrants and 12.6% for visible minorities, indicates a clear differential in access to the labour market (Teelucksingh & Galabuzi, 2005). It is taking much longer for racialized immigrants to catch up with other Canadians, in comparison to past European immigrants. Poverty rates among recent immigrants have increased substantially since 1980 (Statistics Canada, 2003; Picot & Hou, 2003). Racialized men and women are more likely than other groups, except non racialized women, to be working in insecure part time, low wage work (Lightman, Mitchell & Wilson, 2008).
- Muslim Canadians face major obstacles to integration, and experience high unemployment despite high levels of education (PRI Horizons, 2009).
- Recent studies on the diversity of decision-making bodies in all three sectors indicate a massive under-representation of Canada's visible minorities (Cukier & Yap, 2009; Bradshaw, et al, 2009; Yap, 2004). Racialized Canadians are routinely marginalized, misrepresented, or rendered invisible in the Canadian press and in other vehicles of cultural

production (radio, theatre, and museum exhibits) (Henry & Tator, 2003; Sauvageau & Pritchard, 2000).

The 2004 United Nations Mission on contemporary racism concluded that racial discrimination in Canada was tangible as reflected in the high incidence of poverty, overrepresentation in the prison population, racial profiling and under representation of ethnic and racial minorities in the upper and middle layers of political, administrative, economic, cultural and media institutions and mechanisms (Diene, 2004, 21, in Cassin et al., 2007).

Physical and mental health problems are associated with the experience of racism. Racism influences health indirectly through differential exposures related to other determinants of health, for example, education and employment. In fact racism is considered by the WHO to be a root cause of poverty. In Canada, recent data from the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada (LSIC) shows that perceived discrimination has a negative impact on immigrants' life satisfaction (Houle & Schellenberg, 2010) and health (de Maio & Kemp, 2010).

Racism remains a major obstacle to full integration and citizenship (Wood $ Wortley, 2010; Reitz & Bannerjee, 2007; Mock, 2002; Reitz et al., 2009; Weinfeld, 1981). The consequences of social exclusion for racialized groups include a lack of recognition and acceptance, feelings of powerlessness, economic vulnerability, diminished life experiences and limited life prospects (Omidvar & Richmond, 2005; Saloojee, 2005). Of particular concern for racialized immigrants are recent studies suggesting that perceptions and experiences of racial discrimination increase over length of stay (Gee et al., 2006).

The Role of Multiculturalism Policy in Addressing Racism

Despite the many successes of multiculturalism policy, *racism* remains a major obstacle to full integration and inclusive citizenship (Wood & Wortley, 2010; Reitz & Bannerjee, 2007; Mock, 2002; Reitz et al., 2009; Weinfeld, 1981). This poses challenges for multiculturalism policy in Canada in terms of how it it can be used to address racism and hierachies of oppression (Shields et al., 2006; Saloojee, 2005; Shields, 2004). Some recommendations are provided here.

Many scholars consider broad national policies and programs to be to be more effective at reducing social exclusion and improving quality of life than smaller, piecemeal measures such as funding small diversity programs in schools, reducing program fees in certain neighbourhoods, lunch programs, and the like (National Council of Welfare, 2007; Beckfield & Krieger, 2009; Fang et al., 2009; Tugwell et al., 2006). For example, government policies have played an important role in promoting health equity (Raphael, 2010), education, crime reduction and social welfare (Cottingham et al., 2004) and in reducing unemployment (Benach et al., 2010). One of the major barriers to full inclusion is institutional systemic racism. Many believe that laws and policies aimed at eliminating institutional racism in all sectors (public, non-profit, private) may be more effective than other types of anti-racism initiatives or programs such as those that that attempt to foster relationships across various ethnic, religious and racialized communities or act to change public attitudes. Examples of promising institutional policies include (Hyman, 2009; Galabuzi and Teelucksingh, 2010):

- increasing equitable representation of racialized groups throughout an organization,
- ensuring decision-making processes do not exclude or marginalize racialized groups,
- recruiting and retaining professional staff and employees that reflect the diversity of Canadian society
- understanding the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the populations they serve,
- integrating cultural competence and anti-racism perspectives into governance, organizational policy, service planning, and staff recruitment within all institutions.

However, there has been little uniformity in the implementation of anti-racism policies at various levels. As Reitz and Banerjee (2007; 39) note, current policies are "…weakened by their failure to present clear objectives, reflecting a lack of interracial consensus on the significance of the problem of discrimination and a lack of will to create such a consensus [and that] [t]hese policies also lack the means to ensure effective implementation, intergovernmental coordination or evaluation."

One of the most promising ways to promote an anti-racist perspective is through the adoption and support of Racial Impact Analyses at all levels of government. This analysis involves a careful examination of the actual or likely impact of a proposed policy/legislation/ programme or practice in order to best work to minimize resulting disparities or to foster racial equity, racial justice and inclusion. As such it is considered to be a vital tool for identifying, reducing and eliminating long-standing institutional and structural access barriers that contribute to inequities. Colour of Change (2008) has called for racial impact analyses on all legislation, policies, programmes and practices previously passed, and yet to be considered, to determine their impact, either positive or negative, on racial equity and justice (Colour of Change, 2008).

This is especially timely given the recognition that some of our national and provincial policies – human rights, economic immigration, criminal justice, health – have had disproportionately negative impacts on racialized Canadians (Cassin et al., 2007; Color of Change, 2008). Notable examples include the funding cuts to the Court Challenges program; the impact of tax cuts and the cancellation of the Child Care program; the anti-Terrorism Act; Bill C-50 that gives arbitrary power to the current and future Ministers of Citizenship and Immigration to decide what kinds of immigrants will be allowed to enter Canada; and the three month waiting period for universal health coverage.

It has also been recommended that multiculturalism policy be better integrated with policies and programs by targeting for different service sectors and multiple levels of government. For example, across public and private sectors, multiculturalism policy may not be specific enough nor sufficiently coordinated to address racial inequities in Canada that result from institutional barriers including existing immigration and settlement, human rights, and employment policies (Reitz & Bannerjee, 2007). Institutional racism contributes to the immigrant's sense of alienation and may be more harmful than interpersonal discrimination (Wood & Wortley, 2010). At the municipal level, multiculturalism policy is consistent with vibrant and sustainable cities that integrate diverse groups in a just and equitable fashion. For

example, Polese and Stren (2000) define social sustainable cities in terms of "the compatibility of culturally and socially diverse groups, and the reduction in levels of social exclusion of marginalized or disadvantaged groups." Roundtable participants in the PRI discussions also agreed that a comprehensive, coordinated policy with clear objectives, addressing multiple sectors and levels of government and backed by a formal commitment, was needed (Kunz & Sykes, 2007).

The identification and elimination of institutional and structural barriers that impede integration and equality of opportunity for all Canadians is consistent with the aims of social inclusion policy. Saloojee (2005) suggested that government policy should take a leadership role in adopting an inclusion framework that incorporates an anti-racist perspective. In this way multiculturalism policy could be integrated with social inclusion policy aimed at ensuring equitable outcomes and the full and valued participation of all Canadians regardless of their race, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic status, dis/ability, gender, sexual orientation and language proficiency.

Social Capital and the Building of an Inclusive Society

Much attention, both in the form of research and discourse, has been paid to the concept of social capital since the publication of *Bowling Alone,* Putnam's (1995, 2000) treatise linking social capital to a country's social and economic development. The concept of social capital has implications for economic and social development, immigrant integration, health, poverty, social exclusion and neighbourhood revitalization (Galabuzi & Teelucksingh, 2010; Health Canada, 2006; Long & Perkins, 2007; Putnam, 2007; 1995). Social capital can enhance positive outcomes or, on the negative side, impede access to opportunity either through social closure or by virtue of its absence (Putnam, 1995, 2000).

Social capital refers to the "the norms and networks facilitating collective action for mutual benefit" (Woolcock, 1998: 155). It is predicated on reciprocity, trust and the active and willing engagement of citizens within a participative community (Portes, 1998; Coleman, 1988). One of the hypothesized outcomes of social capital is a vibrant civic life (Stone & Hughes, 2002).

Two types of social capital commonly referred to are: bonding social capital, characterized by strong ties within groups populated by like-minded individuals who share a collective orientation (Wuthnow, 2002; Putnam, 1995) and bridging social capital, characterized by weaker, inter-group ties that cross religious, class, age, ethno-racial and economic groups (Putnam, 1995). Frank (2003) also includes linking social capital that builds links not just horizontally but vertically between groups occupying different layers in the economic or political system.

Both bridging and bonding social capital are important for the new immigrant (Kunz, 2003; Li, 2004). Bridging social capital ultimately provides links with others and paves the way for a shared understanding of the new society. In an inclusive society there must be a delicate balance between bonding and bridging social capital. Bonding provides a sense of support and

identity to the newcomer, however, without bridging social capital the newcomer may be insufficiently integrated in to the Canadian mosaic (Berger, Foster & Meinhard, 2008). Having access to close networks of people of the same cultural origin--as well as to programs that support these networks--is associated with the social and economic integration of immigrants (Esses et al., 2009). According to the Canadian Ethnic Diversity Survey (2003), immigrants are more likely than the Canadian-born population to report a strong sense of belonging to their ethnic or cultural group and are more likely to participate in ethnic or immigrant associations (6% vs. 1%). Networks of friends and family for new immigrants in Canada represent an extremely important support, particularly during early stages of settlement (Von Kemenade et al., 2006; Kunz, 2003). Social networks can enhance feelings of belonging, and are considered to be an indicator of social connectedness (Schellenberg, 2004). Economic performance is enhanced for immigrants and racialized groups that have high levels of both bridging and bonding social capital (Li; 2004; Berger et al., 2005)

In addition to bridging and bonding social capital, one can differentiate between individual social capital (i.e., the social networks through which an individual finds the resources he or she needs), and collective social capital (i.e., the networks formed by social groups within a neighbourhood or community to achieve the resources needed to attain their goals). Collective social capital plays an additional role in providing voice to the various ethnic groups that make up Canada's mosaic. As indicated above, evidence suggests that very few of Canada's 'visible minorities' sit in decision making positions in any of the sectors. Groups that have strong collective social capital are more likely to have their voices heard in community and public policy debates (De Leon et al., 2009).

Collective social capital can occur in geographic or community networks. Geographic networks refer to proximal social ties within a confined physical space, such as a building, or several city blocks, or a whole neighbourhood. Immigrants in Canada are likely to reside in 'ethnic enclaves' (i.e., organized on the bases of cultural and national origins rather than race) within racially diverse neighbourhoods as opposed to urban ghettos, which are residentially segregated on racial, ethnic and/or religious bases, although there are some examples of concentrations of racialized people of color at the scale of city blocks or apartment buildings (Qadeer & Kumar, 2003). Ethnic enclaves can facilitate access to entry level employment, financial capital, information about business opportunities and access to markets, provide an informal infrastructure for social service delivery and contribute to a sense of belonging (Qadeer & Kumar, 2006; Li, 2004; Portes, 1998). Neighbourhood ethnic enclaves in Canada generally represent opportunities for social inclusionary pathways, but there are risks of social exclusion, if segregation coincides with structural factors such as low income, underemployment and poor housing (Omidvar & Richmond, 2004; Portes, 1998).

Community networks refer to organizational social ties based on interests and shared values, not necessarily on geographic proximity. These networks are critical for early and long-term immigrant integration and inclusion. Studies of social support among recent immigrants show that many newcomers prefer to stay within their own social/ethnic groups for support and

experience discomfort and other barriers in seeking formal 'mainstream' support (Simich, Mawani et al., 2004). The more institutionally complete a community is, in terms of businesses, churches, banks, and social services, the more it can offer newcomers and established members in terms of resources which increase ethnic attachment and bonding (Kunz, 2005: 55). Over the long term, community organizations are important drivers of social capital through direct service provision and their ability to respond to the social needs arising in their communities (Jedwab, 2008). Some ethnic and/or religious communities (e.g. Ismaili Muslim community, Jewish community, others) provide linguistically and culturally accessible support in health promotion and chronic disease management that can complement mainstream services, including information sessions and support groups for community members. Communities can also demonstrate inspiring resilience in the face of immense challenges. In response to the Asian tsunami, the Toronto Tamil community mobilized, identified needs and accomplished a lot for communities and families in Sri Lanka as well as those here who needed support (Simich et al., 2006). However, many communities do not have the resources or infrastructures to provide such services without government support. The collective social capital of these groups is weaker and the sustainability of their organizations is precarious.

Community networks represent a source of bonding social capital as well as bridging to mainstream and other communities. These forms of social capital contribute to economic, social and civic integration (Berger et al., 2008; Levanon, 2011). Research shows that communities with strong collective identities, that feel welcomed and valued in Canada, demonstrate a strong sense of belonging (i.e. social integration) to Canada and are able to better advocate for themselves (PRI, 2009; Jedwab, 2008). For example, the Somali community was able to challenge the federal government policy delaying their landed immigrant status (Simich, Mawani et al. 2004). Van Kemenade et al., (2006) found strong positive associations between the number of ties with organizations (an indicator of bridging social capital) and self-reported health. However, compared to the Canadian-born population, immigrants and their communities may be at a disadvantage because their networks are smaller, and with fewer resources, which translate into fewer benefits (Kazemipur, 2004). Pre-existing social networks within the established community may also act as barriers to the participation of newcomers or racialized citizens and communities in public, private and non-profit sectors' leadership structures (Galabuzi, 2006).

Research from Western countries shows building mutual support and solidarity within communities (however defined) can be a basis for effective integration into the broader society (Banting, Courchene & Seidle, 2006; Berry et al, 2006; Banting & Kymlicka, 2006; Harty & Murphy, 2005). Bloemraad (2006) compared the integration experiences of Vietnamese immigrants in Boston and Toronto and found that civic integration was much stronger among the latter. After considering alternative explanations, she concluded that Canadian multiculturalism policy may enable newcomer communities to integrate by facilitating community self-organization, leadership, and partnerships. These features also help to enhance the participation of communities in other realms, and the benefits are reciprocal. For example, the advantages of

diverse leadership are well-documented and include increased productivity, effectiveness, responsiveness and innovation (Conference Board of Canada, 2008; DiverseCity, 2011).

Fewer studies have explored collective bridging social capital between diverse communities, as opposed to between a specific ethnic or religious community and the broader 'established' community. It has been suggested that the former, i.e., strengthening inter-community partnerships may result in better integration and stronger national cohesion than the latter. For example, a partnership between the Somali community and the Jewish community in Toronto was described as a successful bridging initiative to address youth unemployment (Toronto Star, 2008). The Hong Fook Mental Health Association, serving Cambodian, Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese communities represents an exemplary and effective partnership model for the delivery of mental health services (Lo & Chung, 2005). This leads one to question whether positive educational outcomes might be obtained through partnerships between newcomer communities with high and low rates of secondary school achievement than other types of educational interventions (Jimenez, 2011).

There is also support for the idea of individuals, organizations and communities from diverse backgrounds coming together for a common purpose or goal (Saloojee, 2005).Examples of collectivist strategies of political mobilization for disadvantaged minority ethnic groups include the civil rights movement in the United States in the 1960s, the recent mobilization of Muslims in the presidential election in France and the current political mobilization of Latin-Americans in the US; but they also raise questions about whether these type of initiatives should be funded by the state (Hansen & Pikkov, 2008).

Other research demonstrates that collective bridging is associated with social and economic benefits and is 'good' for cities (Florida, 2002). Richard Florida (2002) suggested that diversity can be harnessed for community renewal, since it offers new ideas and creative energy vital to the organic process of community building. Investments in diversity and maintaining strong community relationships pay off not just for local or ethnic communities but also for other sectors of society such as the business sector (Prusak & Cohen, 2001). Galabuzi and Teelucksingh (2010: 7) observed that "distinctive identities and practices encourage precisely the notions of cosmopolitan citizenship that accommodate difference in ways that are essential in modern multicultural societies". This growing cosmopolitanism is exemplified by the growing trend for mixed marriages among different ethnicities, races, and religions (Dib et al., 2008). In 2006, mixed unions (marriages and common-law unions) involving a racialized person with a non-racialized person or a person from a different racialized group represented 3.9% of all unions in Canada. This was a 33.1% increase from 2001, more than five times the increase of 6.0% for all couples (Statistics Canada, 2008).

However, there is also a fear that multiculturalism programs emphasizing ethnic or religious differences may inhibit communities from interacting with each other (PRI, 2009). In other words, national, ethnic, racial and religious communities may focus on what divides, rather than what they have in common for example, combating racism (Bannerji, 2000). Mock (2002) further suggests that the politicization of issues related to equality and shared power coupled with a

lack of government funding and/or support for innovative organizational models result in diverse communities competing for power, rather than working collectively.

The Role of Multiculturalism Policy in Building Social Capital

The above examples indicate that supporting and building collective neighbourhood and community capacity yields positive results. Bonding social capital facilitates immigrant integration and intra community cohesion by enhancing social and economic networks within a community. Bridging social capital has been associated with individual integration and represents a promising collective pathway to partnerships across communities and to national cohesion as a whole.

This poses a challenge for multiculturalism policy in terms of how it can support the development of collective bridging and bonding social capital within and across communities. At present it is much easier for ethnic and religious organizations to obtain federal government funding for settlement of newcomers than for long-term integration or community-building activities. As we have seen, community organizations, in addition to delivering culturally and linguistically appropriate economic, social and recreational services, have a major role to play in building a sense of belonging and fostering inclusive citizenship. However, most community agencies do not have the autonomy or resources to introduce programs that meet locally identified needs. Much of their program funding is tied to the delivery of specific services (Wayland 2006: 19). There is no designated source of funding for community organizations for these activities and only limited funding from CIC for cultural events and activities.

Wong (2010) proposed the idea of *interactive multiculturalism* that has a civic component where there are common spaces for people can meet and interact (e.g. formal institutions, voluntary organizations). Common spaces are defined as locations in time and space where diverse groups of Canadians can meet and interact. Examples include workplaces, political parties, schools, neighbourhood facilities and public transport systems which have been described as the vehicles through which a multicultural, multi-racial, multi-religious population develops synergies that are strong enough to lead to a collective national identity (Buzzelli 2001; Dib et al., 2008). With the support of multiculturalism policy, public institutions can play an important role in the creation of common spaces and in ensuring that all public spaces are more sensitive and responsive to diversity (Hansen & Pikkov, 2008; Wood & Wortley, 2010).

Programs that foster inter-community partnerships and social, civic and political engagement are essential to building social capital across and between communities. For example, initiatives such as the DiverseCity (2010) in Toronto are promoting ethnic and racial leadership and participation in all sectors as a key to increased productivity and responsiveness. In February 2011 they surpassed their goal of having 500 leaders from under-represented ethnic and racial backgrounds appointed to agencies, boards and commissions in the GTA. However, many of these initiatives rely on the non-profit sector for funding. Similarly umbrella organizations that act as a collective voice for immigrant-serving organization contribute to the development of bonding and bridging social capital but have no regular source of funding

(Laidlaw, 2004). Multiculturalism policy may consider the provision of sufficient support to organizations that have a broad mandate of building social capital to increase the participation of newcomer and racialized communities and their members in all different levels of public, private and non-profit sectors.

Finally, multiculturalism policy needs to explicitly recognize the role of cities in community building, community bridging and in supporting social, cultural, economic and political participation at the local government level. Local governments influence social capital indirectly through policies and programs aimed at social inclusion e.g., transportation and recreational services. Whether intentionally or not, social policies and programs do foster and encourage common spaces. Saloojee (2005) calls for a renewed commitment to role of municipal governments in promoting and strengthening community organizations representing the interests of diverse communities.

However, at present there is a great deal of variation in municipal responsiveness to official multiculturalism policy in terms of how they address barriers to accessing municipal services and support participation in municipal governance (Good, 2009). Some municipalities such as Toronto and Vancouver recognize the need for long-term capacity building and provide targeted grants to organizations that represent ethno-cultural minorities. However, others are somewhat or less responsive to diversity. Good's research demonstrated that immigrant leaders and at least some municipal governments would welcome a greater level of formal responsibility in multiculturalism policy development and implementation, coupled with access to additional resources (Good, 2009). The Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement (2005) acknowledged the importance of municipal governments in the immigrant settlement policy field and Toronto was the first municipality in Canada to enter into a formal partnership agreement. Good (2009, p. 303) concludes by raising the question 'if measures to empower municipalities and to strengthen the representativeness of local council were taken, then empowering immigrant-magnet communities within Canadian federalism could itself become a sort of multiculturalism policy".

Summary and Conclusions

Canada is the only country in the world where multiculturalism policy is enshrined in our country's constitution. This reflects both our history and our current reality. According to John Ralston Saul (2008), the exposure of our early settlers to the Aboriginal notion of society as inclusive, left a deep impression on the Canadian character, predisposing it to a comfort with diversity. And, never homogeneous, Canada has always had to respect the character and legacies of its founding nations while welcoming new citizens from all over the world. This notwithstanding, as outlined in the paper, our history has been dotted with official discriminatory policies and practices. Nevertheless, as the influx of immigrants extended beyond the founding nationalities, a diverse, pluralistic society was taking form. The multiculturalism policy legislated in 1971 officially recognized and celebrated this diversity. It served to validate the contribution of non-English and French immigrant groups to nation-building and to help them preserve their heritage. It continues to assure newcomers that they are welcome to take their

place as part of the Canadian mosaic. With the passage of the Multiculturalism Act in 1988 official discrimination was a thing of the past.

Despite this, today's new waves of immigrants, mostly from non-European countries, are facing challenges that were not encountered by earlier waves of immigrants. Whether because of global economic circumstances or because of prevailing prejudices, today's immigrants are having a hard time integrating, certainly socially, but also economically. The challenge for multiculturalism policy is not only to recognize and celebrate our diversity, but also to make sure that we are creating an inclusive society, one without barriers, that is defined by our constantly evolving intercultural relationships not by a "we-they" dichotomy (Angus, 2008).

Canada's multiculturalism policy has served the nation well in providing a platform upon which to build a country that reflects not only the diversity within, but also the growing transnational nature of global society. As an overarching policy, it has demonstrated sensitivity to the changing needs of the country and its immigrants. In this paper, we have outlined some of the ways in which multicultural policy needs to move forward in two critical areas: the elimination of racism and the building of collective social capital. In the former area, multiculturalism policy needs to move beyond its federal jurisdiction and support programs from other levels of government as well private initiatives, not only in combating racism, but in creating an inclusive society. With respect to social capital, multiculturalism policy needs to recognize the importance of both bridging and bonding organizations and support them in sustainable ways. Without the civil society infrastructure, integration of new immigrants would be much more difficult. Providing support for collective bridging capital reduces the tendency of feelings of isolation and contributes to social inclusion and shared identity.

The basic idea of multiculturalism is sound. The most successful forms of integration occur when newcomers retain a sense of their heritage and culture while also becoming involved in the larger society (Berger et al., 2005; Berry et al., 2006). Thus, creating individual bonding social capital needs to be supported through ethno-specific groups. These groups then become the conduits for collective social capital through bridging with other groups, thereby reducing social exclusion. Building collective social capital allows for the interplay of diversities on a group level that creates the culturally interwoven fabric that seems to increasingly define what Canada is all about.

While other countries are struggling with the concept, the defining feature of Canadian culture in the minds of the majority of young Canadians, is multiculturalism. Addressing racism and social exclusion and strengthening collective social capital may be among the most promising pathways to being Canadian. Therefore, in addition to providing specific programs aimed at immigrant groups to help them integrate successfully, multiculturalism policy should also focus on broader social inclusionary processes at all levels of government and in all sectors of society to redress inequities and enhance nation building as a whole.

References

Abada, T., Hou, F., & Ram, B. (2008). *Group differences in educational attainment among the children of immigrants*. Analytical Studies Branch Research Paper Series, Catalogue no. 11F0019M — No. 308. Ottawa, Canada: Statistics Canada. Retrieved May 2011 from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11f0019m/11f0019m2008308-eng.pdf

Abella, R.S. (1984). *Equality in employment: The report of the commission on equity in employment*. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

Adams, M. (2009). Muslims in Canada 2007. *PRI Horizons*, 10(2).

Akbari, A.H. (2008). The role of networks in economic integration of new arrivals. *Our Diverse Cities*, 5(Spring), 88 – 90. Canada: Metropolis. Retrieved May 2011 from http://canada.metropolis.net/pdfs/Pgs_ODC_spring2008_networks_e.pdf

Angus, I. (2008). *Identity and justice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Angus Reid. (2010). *Canadians endorse multiculturalism, but pick melting pot over mosaic*. Retrieved May 2011 from: http://www.angus-reid.com/polls/43492/canadians-endorse-multiculturalism-but-pick-melting-pot-over-mosaic.

Bannerji, H. (2000). *The dark side of the nation*. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Banting, K. T., Courchene, T., & Seidie, L. (2006). Belonging? Diversity, recognition and shared citizenship in Canada. In K. Banting & W. Kymlicka (Eds), *multiculturalism and the welfare state: Recognition and redistribution in contemporary democracies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Banting, K., Thomas, J., Courchene, T., & Seidle, L. (2007). *Belonging? Diversity, recognition and shared citizenship in Canada*. Montreal: Institute for Research in Public Policy.

Banting, K., & Kymlicka, W. (2006). Introduction: Multiculturalism and the welfare state: setting the context. In K. Banting & W. Kymlicka (Eds.) *Multiculturalism and the welfare state: Recognition and redistribution in contemporary democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beckfield, J., & Krieger, N. (2009). Epi 1 demos 1 cracy: Linking political systems and priorities to the magnitude of health inequities—Evidence, gaps, and a research agenda. *Epidemiologic Reviews*, 31(1),152-177.

Benach, J., Muntaner, C., Chung, H., Solar, O., Santana, V., & Friel, S. (2005). The importance of government policies in reducing employment related health inequalities. *BMJ, 340.*

Bennett-Jones, O. (2005). Europe's ticking time bomb. *Globe and Mail*, September 3.

Berger, I., Dinca M., Foster, M., & Meinhard, A. (2005). Ethnicity, voluntary behaviourl and social integration. *Proceedings of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada (ASAC*), Toronto, ON.

Berger, I., Foster, M.K., & Meinhard, A. (2008). *Civic engagement, social cohesion and integration in Canada.* Presented at the 12th Biennial Jerusalem Conference in Canadian Studies, June, 2008.

Berry, J.W., Kalin, R. & Taylor, D. (1977) *Multiculturalism and ethnic attitudes in Canada.* Supply and Services Canada, Ottawa.

Berry, J., Phinney, J., Sam, D., & Vedder, P. (2006). Immigrant youth: Acculturation, identity and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 55(3), 303-332.

Bissoondath, N. (2002). *Selling illusions revised edition, the cult of multi-culturalism in Canada.* Second ed. Penguin Canada

Bloemraad, I. (2006). *Becoming a citizen: Incorporating immigrants and refugees in the United States and Canada.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bradshaw, P. et al. (2009). *Results of a national survey of diversity on canadian nonprofit boards.* Presented at the Association for Nonprofit and Social Economy Research, ANSER, Carlton University, Ottawa.

Bush, N. (2008). Multicultural nations: Issues of race and national identity in Britain and Canada. *Theses and dissertations.* Paper 113. Retrieved May 2011 from: http://digitalcommons.ryerson.ca/dissertations/113

Buzzelli, M. (2001). From Little Britain to Little Italy: an urban ethnic landscape study in Toronto. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 27(4), 573–587.

Cassin, A.M., Krawchenko, T., & VanderPlaat, M. (2007). *Racism and discrimination in Canada: Laws, policies and practices.* Multiculturalism and Human Rights Research Reports #3. Atlantic Metropolis Centre/Centre Metropolis Atlantique. Retrieved Feb 2011 from: http://atlantic.metropolis.net/ResearchPolicy/Racism%20and%20Descrimination%20in%20Canada%20-%20%20Report%20May%202007.pdf

Canadian Ethnic Diversity Survey. (2003). Ethnic Diversity Survey 2002. Statistics Canada, *The Daily*. Retrieved May 2011 from: www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/030929/d030929.pdf

Canadian Race Relations Foundation. Retrieved May 2011 from: http://www.crr.ca/component/option,com_glossary/task,list/glossid,70/letter,R/lang,english/

CIC (2010). Multiculturalism website. Retrieved May 2011 from|: http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/multiculturalism/index.asp

CIC (2010). *The current state of multiculturalism in Canada and research themes on Canadian multiculturalism 2008-2010*. Working paper. Retrieved July 2010 from: http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/publications/multi-state/index.asp

Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology,* 94: Supplement, 95-120.

Color of Change. (2008*). Ontario's racial equity justice review with respect to recent federal policies, programs and initiatives*. Retrieved February 2011 from: http://www.ocasi.org/downloads/Federal_Government_Racial_Equity-Racial_Justice_Review_October6_2008.pdf

Conference Board of Canada. (2008). *The value of diverse leadership*. Retrieved May 2011 from:http://www.diversecitytoronto.ca/wpcontent/themes/openair/download/The_Value_of_Diverse_Leadership_CBC_final.pdf

Cottingham, P., Maynard, R., & Stagner, M. (2004). Synthesising evidence on the impacts of programmes and policies in education, crime and justice, and social welfare: Practical recommendations. *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 18(1), 28-53.

Cukier, W., & Yap, M. (2009). *Diversity counts: A snapshot of diversity in the Greater Toronto Area.* Toronto: The Diversity Institute in Management and Technology, Ted Rogers School of Management, Ryerson University.

Dauvergne, M., Scrim, K., & Brennan, S. (2008). Hate crime in Canada, 2006. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 85F0033M. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. No. 17. Retrieved Feb 2011 from:www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85f0033m/85f0033m2008017-eng.htm

De Leon, E., Maronick, M., De Vita, C., & Boris, E.T. (2009). *Community-based organizations and immigrant integration in the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Area.* Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

De Maio, F.G., & Kemp E. (2010). The deterioration of health status among immigrants to Canada. *Global Public Health*. 5(5), 462-478.

Department of Justice. (1985). *Canadian Multiculturalism Act. Section 3. Canadian Multiculturalism Policy.* Retrieved May 2011 from: http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-18.7/

Department of Justice. (1985). Canadian Human Rights Act. Retrieved from: http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/h-6/t

Dewing, M., & Leman, M. (2006). *Canadian multiculturalism*. Library of Parliament, Canada. Retrieved February1, 2011 from: http://www2.parl.gc.ca/content/lop/researchpublications/936-e.htm

Dib, K., Donaldson, I., Turcotte, B. (2008). Integration and identity in Canada: The importance of multicultural common spaces. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 40 (1), 161-187.

DiverseCity. (2010). Retrieved Feb 2011 from: http://www.diversecitytoronto.ca/research/

Ebersold, S. (1998). *Exclusion and disability*. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development: Centre for Educational Research and Innovation. Retrieved from the OECD web site: http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/20/17/1856907.pdf

Edmonton Journal (February 13, 2011). Retrieved May 2011 from: http://www.edmontonjournal.com/opinion/Multiculturalism+failure+Europe/4273602/story.html

Edwards, B.F.R. (2010). Who do we think we are: Writings on citizenship and identity in the twenty-first century. *Journal of Canadian Studies, 44*(1), 221-228.

Esses, V., Hamilton, L.K., Bennet-AbuAyyash, C., & Burnstein, M. (2009). *Characteristics of a welcoming community*. Report to CIC. Retrieved May 2011 from: http://ceris.metropolis.net/research-policy/Characteristics%20of%20a%20Welcoming%20Community-%20Symposium.pdf

Fang, R., Kmetic, A., Millar, J., & Drasic, L. (2009). Disparities in chronic disease among Canada's low-income populations. *Prev Chronic Dis*, 6(4). Retrieved Feb 2011 from: http://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2009/oct/08_0254.htm.

Fennema, M., & Tillie, J. (2001). Civic community, political participation and political trust of ethnic groups, *Connections*, *24* (1), 26–41.

Fennema, M., & Tillie, J. (1999). Political participation and political trust in Amsterdam: Civic communities and ethnic networks, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *25* (4), 703–26.

Fleras, A., & Kunz, J.L. (2001). *Media and minorities: Representing diversity in a multicultural Canada*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.

Florida, R. (2002) *The rise of the creative class and how it's transforming work, leisure and everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.

Focus Canada. (2006). *Canadians' attitudes toward Muslims* (Environics). Retrieved May 2011 from:http://research-environics-net.sitepreview.ca/news/Environics_Muslims_Canada_Research_Prospectus.pdf

Frank, J. (2003). Making social capital work for public policy. *Horizons,* 6:3. Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.

Frideres, J. (2008). Creating an inclusive society. In J. Biles, M. Burstein, J. Frideres (Eds). *Immigration and integration in Canada*. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Galabuzi, G.E. (2004). Social exclusion. In D. Raphael (Ed.). *Social determinants of health: Canadian perspectives*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press, Inc. pp235-251.

Galabuzi, G.E. (2006). *Canada's economic apartheid: The social exclusion of racialized groups in the new century*. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Galabuzi, GE. (2008). Social exclusion. In, D. Raphael (Ed). *Social determinants of health: Canadian perspectives.* Canadian Scholar's Press, Toronto. 2nd

Galabuzi, G.E., & Teelucksingh, C. (2010). *Social cohesion, social exclusion, social capital.* Regional Municipality of Peel. Retrieved May 2011 from: http://www.peelregion.ca/social-services/pdfs/discussion-paper-1.pdf

Gee, G. C., Ryan, A., Laflamme, D. J., & Holt, J. (2006). Self-reported discrimination and mental health status among African descendants, Mexican Americans, and other Latinos in the New Hampshire REACH 2010 Initiative: The added dimension of immigration. *American Journal of Public Health*, 96(10), 1821-1828.

Good, K (2009). *Municipalities and multiculturalism: the politics of immigration in Toronto and Vancouver*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gregg, A. (2006). Identity crisis. *The Walrus.* March. Vol. 3, No. 2.

Griffiths, R. (2009). *Who we are: A citizen manifesto*. Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre.

Hansen, R. & Pikkov, D. (2008). Integration of immigrants: A defence. Paper Presented at the Conference on Les Citoyennetés À L'ère De La Mondialisation, University Of Montreal, April 4.

Harty, S. & Murphy, M. (2005*). In defence of multicultural citizenship*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Health Canada. (2002). *An inclusion lens*. Workbook for looking at social and economic exclusion and inclusion. Population and Public Health Branch, Atlantic Region.

Henry, F., & Tator, C. (2006). *Racial profiling in Canada: Challenging the myth of 'a few bad apples*'. University of Toronto Press.

Hiebert, D., Schuurman, N., & Heather, S. (2007). *Multiculturalism on the ground: The social geography of immigrant and visible minority populations in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver*. Working paper #07-12, RIIM, Metropolis British Columbia.

Houle, R., & Schellenberg, G. (2010). *New immigrants' assessments of their life in Canada* (Catalogue no. 11F0019M – No. 322). Retrieved from Statistics Canada web site: http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11f0019m/11f0019m2010322-eng.pdf

Howe, P. (2007). The Political engagement of new Canadians: A comparative perspective. In Keith G. Banting, Thomas J. Courchene & F. Leslie Seidle, (Eds.), *Belonging? Diversity, recognition and shared citizenship in Canada.* Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Hyman, I. (2009). *Racism as a determinant of immigrant health*. Ottawa: Public Health Agency of Canada and Metropolis Canada. Retrieved Feb 2011 from: http://canada.metropolis.net/pdfs/racism_policy_brief_e.pdf

Hyman, I., Mercado, R., Galabuzi, G.E., & Patychuk, D. (in press). *A critical review of existing indicators of social and economic exclusion and inclusion in Canada.* Draft Report to Human Resources and Social Development Canada. October.

Jedwab, J. (2008). The rise of the unmeltable Canadians? Ethnic and national belonging in Canada's second generation. *Canadian Diversity*. Spring, 6(2).

Jimenez, M. (2011). Immigrant integration and Canadian federalism: Exploring the issues. Conference organized by the Forum of Federations and The Mowat Centre. January.

Kallen, E. (1982). Multiculturalism: Ideology, policy and reality. *Journal of Canadian Studies, 17* (1), 51.

Karlsen, S., & Nazroo, J. Y. (2002). Relation between racial discrimination, social class, and health among ethnic minority groups. *American Journal of Public Health, 92*(4), 624-631.

Kazemipur, A. (2004). *Social capital of immigrants in Canada*. PCERII Working Paper No.WP04-04). Retrieved from Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration web site: http://pmc.metropolis.net/WorkingPapers/WP04.04.pdf

Kunz, J.L. (2003). Social capital: A key dimension of immigrant integration. *Canadian Issues*, April.

Kunz, J.L. (2005). Orienting newcomers to Canadian society: Social capital and settlement. In, *Social Capital in Action: Thematic Policy Studies* (pp. 52-64). Ottawa, ON: Policy Research Initiative.

Kunz, J.L., & Sykes, S. (2007). *From mosaic to harmony: Multicultural Canada in the 21st century: Results of regional roundtables.* Policy Research Institute. Report to Government of Canada.

Kymlicka, Will. (1998). *Finding our way: Rethinking ethnocultural relations in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press Canada.

Kymlicka, W. (2007). Ethnocultural diversity in a liberal State: Making sense of the Canadian model(s)**.** In Keith Banting, Thomas J. Courchene & F. Leslie Seidle, (Eds.) *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada*. Montreal: Institute for Research in Public Policy.

Kymlicka, W. (2010). *The current state of multiculturalism in Canada and research themes on Canadian multiculturalism 2008-2010*. Paper prepared for CIC. Retrieved Feb/11 from: http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/publications/multi-state/index.asp

Laidlaw Foundation. (2004). *What role do ethnoracial umbrella organizations play in developing social capital and promoting social inclusion?* Retrieved Feb 2011 from: http://www.laidlawfdn.org/what-role-do-ethnoracial-umbrella-organizations-play-developing-social-capital-and-promoting-social-

Lightman, E., Mitchell, A., & Wilson, B. (2008). *Poverty is making us sick: A comprehensive survey of income and health in Canada.* Toronto, Canada: Community Social Planning Council of Toronto and Wellesley Institute. Retrieved from: http://socialplanningtoronto.org/healthequitylightman2008.pdf

Li, P. (2003). *Destination Canada: Immigration debates and issues.* Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Lo, H. & Chung, R. C. Y. (2005). The Hong Fook experience: Working with ethnocultural communities in Toronto 1982-2002. *Transcultural Psychiatry, 42*(3), 457-477.

Long, D. A., & Perkins, D.D. (2007). Community social and place predictors of sense of community: A multilevel and longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Community Psychology* 35 (5), 563-581.

Macpherson, W. (1999). *The Stephen Lawrence inquiry. Report of an inquiry by Sir William Macpherson of Cluny*. Chapter 6: 6.34. London: Stationery Office. Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2008). Retrieved Dec 15, 2008 from: http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/racism.

Mock, K. (2002). *Redefining multiculturalism.* Adapted from a presentation at the University of Victoria conference Changing Multicultural Identities and published by the University of Victoria in 2002 on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of the Multiculturalism Policy.

Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada. (1990). *The Canadian Multiculturalism Act: a guide for Canadians:* Ottawa, Ont.

Murdie, R.A. (2008). *Diversity and concentration in Canadian immigration*. Centre for Urban & Community Studies Research Bulletin, 42. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Centre for Urban and Community Studies. Retrieved from http://www.urbancentre.utoronto.ca/pdfs/researchbulletins/CUCSRB42-Murdie-Cdn-Immigration3-2008.pdf

Mwarigha, M.S. (2002). *Towards a framework for local responsibility: Taking action to end the current limbo in immigrant settlement - Toronto*. Toronto: The Maytree Foundation.

Nakhaie, RM., Smylie, L. K., & Arnold, R. (2007). Social inequalities, social capital, and health of Canadians. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 39(4), 562-585.

National Council of Welfare (2007). Retrieved June 2009 from: http://www.ncwcnbes.net/en/home.html

OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). (2006). *Where immigrant students succeed: A comparative review of performance and engagement in PISA 2003* (OECD, Program for International Student Assessment).

Oliver, Senator Donald (2006). *Canadian Multiculturalism in Theory and Practice: Individual and Group Rights*. Presentation to University of Aarhus, Copenhagen, Denmark - October 13th, 2006. Retrieved June 2011 from: http://www.senatordonaldoliver.ca/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=36&Itemid=54

Omidvar, R., & Richmond, T. (2005). Immigrant settlement and social inclusion in Canada. In T. Richmond & A. Saloojee (Eds). *Social inclusion Canadian perspectives*. Laidlaw Foundation.

Patychuk, D., & Hyman, I. (2009). *Income adequacy and processes of marginalization and social exclusion.* Prepared for Public Health Agency of Canada, Strategic Initiatives and Innovations Directorate.

Pendakur, Ravi, & Cardozo, A. (2007). *Canada's visible minority population: 1967-2017.* Report Commissioned by the Research Directorate, Multiculturalism and Human Rights Branch, Department of Canadian Heritage. Ottawa.

Pendakur, K., & Pendakur, R. (2007). Minority earnings disparity across the distribution. *Canadian Public Policy*, *33*(1), 41-60.

Perreault, S. (2008). *Visible minorities and victimization – 2004.* Catalogue no. 85F0033MIE – No. 015. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Picot, G., & Hou, F. (2003). *The rise in low-income rates among immigrants in Canada*. Analytic Studies Research Paper Series 11F0019MIE2003198. Analytic Studies Branch. Ottawa. Statistics Canada.

Polese, M., & Stren, R. (2000). *The social sustainability of cities: Diversity and management of change.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Popay, J., Enoch, E., Johnston, H., & Rispel, L. (2006). *Social exclusion knowledge network (SEKN).* The Central Co-ordinating Hub for the SEKN. Submitted to the Commission of Social Determinants of Health, World Health Organization.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24:1-24.

Policy Research Initiative. (2009). *Understanding Canada's "3M" (multicultural, multi-linguistic and multi-religious) reality in the 21st century*. Report to Government of Canada.

Policy Research Initiative. (2009). Religious diversity in Canada. *Horizons*, March, Volume 10 Number 2

Policy Research Initiative. (2005). *Social capital as a public policy tool: Project report*. Ottawa, ON: Government of Canada.

Prusak, L., & Cohen, D. (2001). How to invest in social capital. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(6), 86-97.

Putnam, R. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Putnam, R. D. (2001). Social capital measurement and consequences. *ISUMA: Canadian Journal of Policy Research, 2*(1), 41-51.

Putnam, R. D. (2007). E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies, 30*(2), 137-174.

Qadeer, M. (2003). *Ethnic segregation in a multicultural city: The case of Toronto, Canada.* CERIS Working Paper Series, No. 28).

Qadeer, M. (2005). Ethnic segregation in a multicultural city, Toronto, Canada. *Urban spatial segregation: A land policy perspective*. New York: SUNY Press.

Qadeer, M., & Kumar, S. (2003). Toronto's residential mosaic. *Ontario Planning Journal, 18*(5), 7-9.

Qadeer, M., Agrawal, S.K,, & Lovell, A. (2007). Evolution of ethnic enclaves in the Toronto Metropolitan Area, 2001-2006. *Journal of International Migration and Integration,* 11(3), 315-339. Retrieved Feb 2011 from: http://www.springerlink.com/content/b38261053028t766/

Patychuk, D., & Hyman, I. (2009). Processes of marginalization and social exclusion. In, *Scan of monitoring indicators for health disparities and social determinants of health*. Public Health Agency of Canada, Strategic Initiatives and Innovations Directorate Health Promotion and Chronic Diseases Prevention Branch.

Ray, B., & Preston, V. (2009). Geographies of discrimination: Variations in perceived discomfort and discrimination in Canada's gateway cities. *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies, 7*(3), 228-249.

Reitz, J.G., Breton, R., Dion, K.K., & Dion, K.L. (2009). *Multiculturalism and social cohesion potentials and challenges of diversity VIII*, 196. Springer.

Reitz, J.G., & Banerjee, R. (2007). Ethnocultural communities: Participation and social cohesion. In K. Banting, T.J. Courchene, and F.L. Seidle (Eds.) *Belonging? Diversity, recognition and shared citizenship.* Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy. p. 489–546.

Roeher Institute. (2003). *Policy approaches to framing social inclusion and social exclusion: An overview*. Toronto: The Roeher Institute.

Rosaldo, C. (1996). *Toward a definition of multiculturalism*. Retrieved February 1, 2011 from: http://www.rosado.net/pdf/Def_of_Multiculturalism.pdf

Saloojee, A. (2001). *Social inclusion, citizenship and diversity.* Retrieved from: http://www.ccsd.ca/subsites/inclusion/bp/as.htm

Saloojee, A. (2005). Social inclusion, anti-racism and democratic citizenship. In, In, T. Richmond & A. Saloojee (Eds). *Social inclusion Canadian perspectives*. Laidlaw Foundation.

Saul, J. R. (2008). *A fair country: Telling truths about Canada*. Toronto: Viking Canada

Schellenberg, G. (2004). Perceptions of Canadians: A sense of belonging, confidence and trust. Canadian. *Social trends*. Winter.

Sauvageau, Florian & Pritchard, D. (2000). Surveying attitudes. *Media Magazine,* Retrieved February 4, 2007 from: http://www.caj.ca/mediamag/winter2000/media2000_15.html

Shields, J., Rah, K., & Scholtz, R. (2006). *Voices from the margins: Visible minority immigrant youth experiences with employment exclusion in Toronto*, Joint Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Settlement - Toronto (CERIS) Working Paper Series, No. 47, May, 62.

Shields, J. (2004). No safe haven: Markets, welfare and migrants. In, P. Kretsendemas and A. Aparacio (Eds.). *Immigrants, welfare reform and the poverty of policy*. New York: Praeger, pp. 35-60.

Shields, M. (2008). Community belonging and self-perceived health. *Health Reports,* 19;2. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 82-003-XWE. Ottawa, Canada: Statistics Canada. Retrieved from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/82-003-x/2008002/article/10552-eng.pdf

Shookner, M. (2002). *An inclusion lens: Workbook for looking at social and economic exclusion and inclusion.* Ottawa, Health Canada.

Simich L., Mawani, F.N., Wu, F., & Noor, A. (2004). Meanings of social support, coping, and help-seeking strategies among immigrants and refugees in Toronto. *CERIS Working Paper Series.* Toronto**:** 67.

Simich, L., Rummens, J.A., Anderrman, L., & Lo, T. (2006). Mental health in public-health policy and practice: providing culturally-appropriate services in acute and post-emergency situations. *CERIS Working Paper Series*. Toronto, CERIS**:** 26.

Soroka, S., Johnston, R., & Banting, K. (2007). Ties that bind: Social cohesion and diversity in Canada. In K. Banting, T. J. Courchene and F. L. Seidle, (Eds). *Belonging? Diversity, recognition and shared citizenship in Canada*. Montreal: Institute for Research in Public Policy.

Statistics Canada. (2001). Intermarriage of visible minorities increasing. *Census of Canada.* Retrieved from: http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census01/products/analytic/companion/etoimm/canada.cfm#threefold_increase

Statistics Canada.(2003). *Ethnic Diversity Survey: Portrait of a multicultural society.* Ottawa. Cat. 89-593-XIE.

Statistics Canada. (2008). *Canada's ethnocultural mosaic, 2006*. Census. Ottawa. Catalogue No. 97-562-X. Retrieved from: http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/english/census06/analysis/ethnicorigin/pdf/97-562-XIE2006001.pdf

Stone, W., & Hughes, J., (2002). Social capital. Empirical meaning and measurement validity. *Research Paper, Australian Institute of Family Studies,* 27, (June).

Teelucksingh, C. & Galabuzi, G.E. (2005). *Working precariously: The impact of race and immigrants status on employment opportunities in Canada*. Canadian Race Relations Foundation. Retrieved May 2009 from: http://www.amillionreasons.ca/WorkingPrecariously.pdf

Toronto Star (2008). Retrieved Feb 2011 from: http://www.thestar.com/article/526450

Tugwell, P., O'Connor, A., Andersson, N., Mhatre, S., Kristjansson, E., &Jacobsen, M. (2006). Reduction of inequalities in health: Assessing evidence-based tools. *International Journal for Equity in Health, 5*(1), 11.

Van Kemenade, S., Roy, J., & Bouchard, L. (2006). *Social networks and vulnerable populations. Findings from the GSS. social capital and health: Maximizing the benefits.* Health Policy Research, Health Canada. Retrieved May 2011 from: http://hc-sc.gc.ca/sr-sr/pubs/hpr-rpms/bull/2006-capital-social-capital/2006-capital-social-capital-4_e.html.

Wayland, SV. (2006). *Unsettled: Legal and policy barriers for newcomers to Canada*. A Joint Initiative of Community Foundations of Canada and the Law Commission of Canada.

Weinfeld M. (1981). Canada. In, R.G. Wirsing (Ed). *Protection of ethnic minorities*. Pergamon Press.

Woolcock, M. (1998). Social capital and economic development: Toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and Society* 27(2): 151-208

Wong. (2010). Debunking the fragmentation critique of MC. *Diverse.*

Wood, P.B., & Wortley, S. (2010). AlieNation: Racism, injustice and other obstacles to full citizenship. *CERIS Working Paper* No. 78. Retrieved May 2011 from: http://ceris.metropolis.net/Virtual%20Library/other/CWP78.pdf

Wuthnow, R. (2002), Religious involvement and status-bridging *social capital*. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41, 669–684

Yap, M. (2004). *Gender and racial differentials in compensation, promotions and separations.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of Toronto.

Zeman, K., & Bressan, A. (2006). *Factors associated with youth delinquency and victimization in Toronto*. Retrieved Feb. 2011 from: http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/collection_2008/statca