

**Challenges in Canadian Cultural Discourses: Multiculturalism vis-à-vis  
Interculturalism and the Political 'Othering' of Canada's Cultural Fabric**

Mireille Nassrallah

Thesis submitted to the  
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the M.A. in Communication

Department of Communication  
Faculty of Arts  
University of Ottawa

### **Abstract**

The process of identification for émigrés in host countries requires an investigation into the “politics of identity”, and epistemological tensions of how identity is conceptualized and practiced in the context of multicultural environments. Indeed, multiculturalism frameworks in Canada have emerged from attempts to manage coexisting cultures living in the nation-state.

This research is a comparative theoretical discussion that mobilizes postmodern perspectives to open limited notions of Canadian identity, and describes the potential challenges that English Canadian and Francophone Quebec multicultural frameworks raise in cultural identification for Canada as a whole, and specifically for émigrés. Secondary literature for the analysis of multicultural frameworks is examined with citizenship markers from Census of Canada questionnaires, to conceptualize Canadian identity through discourse.

The findings: (1) postulate how the multiculturalist framework in English Canada and the politics of intercultural identity in Quebec intervene in the meaning-making process of national identity and thus impede on the preservation and development of different cultural identities; and (2) discover that both frameworks of multiculturalism and interculturalism, as an institutionalization of social justice and equality, should be reframed or refined due to the limiting conceptualization of cultural identity as fluid. The findings conclude that multiculturalism, interculturalism, and citizenship frameworks may not provide effective strategies to balance the relationship between different groups with regards to ethnic and cultural rights and equality, and that these frameworks should be revisited to account for, and represent, the complexities of identity in Canada.

### **Acknowledgments**

Foremost, I would like to give glory to God for all my blessings; I am able to do all things through Him who strengthens me.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Professor Boulou Ebanda de B'éri for his valued supervision, for his perspective and support academically, his continued encouragement, and for our conversations. I am also thankful to Professor Aliaa Dakroury and Professor Mark Lowes for their insight and input.

I wish to thank my family (immediate and extended) who have displayed resilience on my behalf throughout this process, and have unconditionally supported me in countless ways. A special thanks to my friends, who frequently took delight in even the smallest of my progress and accomplishments.

### Summary

The position of cultural discourses, including cultural identity, is a dynamic force contingent on many variables, including mainstream discourse, ideologies, and policies. By finding in the analysis epistemological tensions in the way Canadian discourses conceptualize significant identity dimensions such as nationality, culture, and ethnicity, the research uncovers that Canadian diversity management tools do not account for identity experiences of the entire population, and create conditions of marginalization and assimilation that impede the possibility of equal opportunity for the entire population. However, this research argues that by acknowledging the fluidity of identity experiences, the state can better represent and embody equality amongst a heterogeneous population, which is currently lacking.

Essentializing identity limits the capability to understand current complexities in the Canadian population and culture, and in turn poses challenges to implementing policies that reflect the needs and wants of an unrepresented population. Furthermore, identity is being formulated as a distinction between the dominant Western culture and all other backgrounds. Indeed, the discussion of cultural discourse(s) in Canada is necessary.

This research concludes that the classification of Canadians is associated with the origins of an individual, and that the dynamics and complexities of individual identity are not being accounted for in Canadian multiculturalism, Quebec interculturalism, and Canadian citizenship in general. There is a need to rethink the latter concepts in order to transcend traditional notions that essentialize identity characteristics, and achieve ones that encompass individual complexities in relation to personal identification, as well as in relation to the identification of others. This research suggests the integration of transcultural and

transnational means of conceptualizing identity into Canada's current social fabric and cultural discourses to address some of the limitations of current frameworks.

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b> .....	ii
<b>Acknowledgments</b> .....	iii
<b>Summary</b> .....	iv
<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
Research Objective.....	4
Background and History.....	5
Theoretical Location.....	6
Research Questions.....	10
<b>Methodology</b> .....	12
Data Collection.....	14
Challenges of Data Collection.....	15
Structural Limitations of this Investigation.....	16
Overview.....	18
<b>Chapter 1 – The Case of Anglo-Canada</b> .....	19
Canadian Multicultural Challenges.....	20
As a Concept.....	21
Different Applications.....	24
The Emergence of Multiculturalism as a Canadian Policy.....	26
Multiculturalism Survival in a Liberal Democracy.....	30
Canada’s Experience with Multiculturalism.....	34
Interpretations and Observations of Canadian Multiculturalism .....	39
<b>Chapter 2 – The Case of Francophone Quebec</b> .....	41
Interculturalism and Multiculturalism in Quebec.....	42
Quebec Political and Cultural History.....	43
The French Language and Immigration.....	46
Civic Citizenship and Ethnic Accommodation.....	49
Narratives and Power.....	52
Émigrés Intercultural Experiences.....	54
Canadian Multicultural Diversity Policies Compared.....	59
Chapter 2 Summary.....	62
<b>Chapter 3 – Citizenship Analysis through the Census of Canada</b> .....	65
The Markers of Citizenship.....	67
Questioning the Units of Analysis.....	69
Cross-Referencing.....	85
Units of Analysis - Markers vs. Meanings.....	86
Citizenship Markers vs. Literature.....	90
Citizenship Markers and Literature vis-à-vis Experience.....	99

<b>Chapter 4 – Final Conclusion</b> .....	105
<b>Appendix A</b> .....	114
<b>Appendix B</b> .....	125
<b>Appendix C</b> .....	126
<b>Appendix D</b> .....	127
<b>Appendix E</b> .....	128
<b>Appendix F</b> .....	129
<b>Works Cited</b> .....	130
<b>Endnotes</b> .....	137

### **Introduction**

Concepts of identity and the action and process of identification were traditionally limited to defined and static characteristics for determining and recognizing the self. However, an increase in international migration, and advancements in technology have transformed today's social and cultural landscapes. The population of nation-states such as Canada expanded to include individuals from multiple ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Technology also gave cultures the means to permeate more freely to countries with diverse émigrés, which created new visible identification challenges. Émigré nation-states emerged and identification complexities grew illusive, which discernibly challenged the once seemingly intelligible process of self-identification. Countries such as Canada began to experience a growth of diverse ethnic identities, and concurrent cultural identities in majority cultures. Consequently, this resulted in further identity complexities as émigrés transported personal cultural experiences to host countries that already inhabit a profusion of mixed cultures within nation-state boundaries.

However, to what extent is the production of a nation based on constructed meaning and not state borders? Anderson (1983) describes nationality as socially constructed and imagined; a community becomes distinguishable by the style in which they are imagined, and not by their genuineness or falsity (pp. 2 & 7). Nation-state boundaries have rarely corresponded to the cultures they artificially circumscribe, "notwithstanding the case that such national cultures have had to be created institutionally through careful efforts of the state" (Benessaieh 2012, p. 2).

For Canada, according to Ignatieff, (1994) "the Canadian federation's essential problem has always been that the Francophone Québécois identify Quebec as their nation and Canada as their state, while English-speaking Canada identifies Canada as both their

nation and as their state” (p. 148). Ignatieff, like Anderson (1983), acknowledges the possibility for more than one nationality within a state, which describes the prominent debate on national identity in Canada, and the duality of identity articulations and longstanding cultural struggles between Quebec and the rest of Canada.

However, identity struggles in Canada reach further than Quebec-Canada cultural and language duality. For Dhamoon and Abu-Laban (2009), Canada currently stands out as having a combination of four major internal differences: “that between an indigenous population and a settler population; that between whites and nonwhites; that between European groups (French and British origin or French speakers and English speakers); and that between immigrants and native-born” (p. 164). Within Canada and Quebec’s identity articulations dwell ethnic and national identities, presenting dilemmas in cultural discourses. Throughout many contemporary democracies, integration of immigrant minorities has been placed as a priority in political agendas (Banting & Soroka, 2010, p. 156). Thus, as an émigré state, Canada required formal policies to manage different cultural relations to encourage social cohesion.

As Canada’s liberal democratic values promote equality, intervention from the state was required to police cultural identities, to which Canada instituted a political system of multiculturalism as a diversity management framework. However, Quebec is the only province that sustains its own intercultural policy that rejects both federal policies of multiculturalism and the English-French bilingualism (Ghosh, 2004, p. 556).

Multiculturalism and interculturalism are often debated and accompanied with ambiguities and juxtaposed discourses, specifically considering challenges of cultural diversity. Abu-Laban and Nieguth (2000) state “it is surprising that a less central issue in empirical analysis has related to ethnic minorities, especially considering the relevance of

immigration...and the public debate over the vices or virtues of multiculturalism (as policy and ideology)” given Canada’s multi-ethnic, multiracial and multilingual character (p. 466) - specifically as Canada’s per capita immigration rate is one of the highest (Ibrahim, 2011, p. 17).

This research is particularly relevant as it historically enumerates the ways in which multiculturalism and interculturalism emerged, and problematized the grounds by which they relate to each other as frameworks of political and cultural discourses. The following research discusses multiculturalism in its beginnings as a concept, towards its emergence as a policy in Canada, its relationship to Quebec, and finally the outcome of its implementation on émigrés and on Quebec. Further, the research provides an empirical account of measuring émigrés’ experiences through the use of citizenship in the Census of Canada in order to suggest possible means to improve how multiculturalism and interculturalism reflects population identity characteristics.

This research uncovers how narratives of multiculturalism and interculturalism prepare the foundation of Canadian identity discourses, to discover where multicultural and intercultural diversity management positions émigré minorities within the terrain of cultural relations in the nation-state.

Cultural discourses are social constructs that create meaning in society, to which individuals identify themselves; these ideologies construct how individuals create meaning of their reality. Narrow categories of identity are in place and limit the capacity for individuals to form an understanding of the complexities of identity experiences of a population, including their own. Society is currently confined to homogenous socially constructed discourses of meaning.

**Research Objective**

The following research is a two-part qualitative comparative study that reviews what multiculturalism and interculturalism signify in the Canadian sociopolitical context for policing national identity in Canada and Quebec. This research examines obstacles encountered by these diversity management policies<sup>i</sup> for Canadian discourses of identity and equality. The research first postulates how the multiculturalist framework in English Canada and the politics of intercultural identity in Quebec intervene in the meaning-making processes of cultural identities, creating inequality in the population. Second, the research discovers that both frameworks of multiculturalism and interculturalism, as an institutionalization of social justice, should be reframed or refined due to the limiting conceptualization of identity as fluid, as seen through the analysis of citizenship.

This research uses postmodernist approaches to critically analyze the portrayal of Canadian identity discourses in multiculturalism and interculturalism policies. Through the postmodern perspective, identity is no longer limited to mainstream ideologies and discourses embedded in an individual's surroundings (Abrudan, 2010, p. 23). The specific construction of cultural identities and interrelations of groups are thus constantly evolving to respond to changing political, ideological, and economic conditions in their environment (Cornwell and Stoddard, 2001, p. 2).

As these policies look at the citizenship of the individual, the second part of the research uses citizenship as an empirical reference to discuss Canadian identity discourses, and compares the findings to multicultural and intercultural discourses. Indeed, citizenship evokes notions of a national identity, as well as sovereignty and state control (Bloemraad, Korteweg and Yurdakul, 2008, p. 153). Through the analysis of Census of Canada

questionnaires, the research qualifies citizenship to demonstrate the way identity is impacted by how the state frames and creates the sense of Canadian identity.

### **Background and History**

Multiculturalism as a concept has a history of debate and is theorized by numerous scholars internationally. However, Canada was the first country to adopt the concept of multiculturalism as a formal political framework that polices cultural diversity. It remains a distinct policy in the Canadian cultural and political setting.

In recent years, Canadian multiculturalism has consistently been accompanied by a paradox of challenges situated on separate ends of a spectrum. According to Karim (2008) the range of the two discursive ends are that multiculturalism is pushing towards the disintegration of Canadian society on the one hand, and on the other, that it is strengthening the nation in which Canadians of all types of backgrounds have a sense of belonging (p. 58). Garcea (2008) identifies the same central question in multicultural debates in Canada, whether it contributes to harmony and integration, or to conflict and fragmentation (p. 142). Ultimately, regardless of which end of the spectrum it falls, multiculturalism is a driving force behind organizing society, whether on a broad scale or on an individual level.

Canada and Quebec have differing notions of national identity within the nation-state, which is a primary indication of the differences in values between their social systems. Some critics of multiculturalism argue that the interculturalism model evolved in opposition to Canadian multiculturalism (Garcea, Kirova, & Wong, 2008, p. 3). While Canada's multicultural discourse seems to rest on the existence of cultural differences with no "official culture" and an English-French bilingual framework, Quebec has a longstanding agenda of maintaining Francophone Quebec culture with inherent concerns of losing a distinct identity

with the French language at the core. The self-perceptions of being a vulnerable minority within English North America, is therefore a primary reason why multiculturalism has been less popular in Quebec (Kymlicka, 2010, p. 17).

Struggles for competing national and cultural power and recognition created tensions for unity between Francophone Quebec and the rest of Canada (Milne, 1991, p. 38). The Quebec population constructed their national narrative against the rest of Canada as a battle for recognition as a distinct nation group. Quebec thus rejects the federal government's multiculturalism policy and in its place institutes the interculturalism policy, with the objective of maintaining a particular francophone Quebec identity. Abu-Laban and Gabriel (2002) contend that the state is indeed a key player within the politics of identity that determines which identity claims are taken into account, and how they are represented in state actions or policy (p. 14). Although multiculturalism and interculturalism differ in identity discourses and narratives, implementing either policy has a substantial impact on citizen engagement and the outcome of cultural relations within the nation-state, including émigré groups. The research discusses the impact of both these policies on the Canadian population as a whole, without neglecting the potential "influence" or "threat" on émigré minorities in Canada.

### **Theoretical Location**

Anderson's (1983) claim that national culture is assembled as a fluid "arena" contradicts the notion of static authentic identification and necessitates a revisiting of traditional notions of culture and nationhood, to incorporate human agency into identity discourses. Indeed, this assertion seems to illustrate the very notion of multiculturalism. The collection of cultural experiences of an émigré nation-state such as Canada fosters the

normative construction of new concepts of Canadian-ness. Lyotard<sup>ii</sup> (1984) describes narration as “the quintessential form of customary knowledge...” (p. 19). Dominant narratives transform discourses and make sense of identity within Canada, as narratives actively legitimate the acceptance of ideological knowledge. According to Bhabha, (1990b) narratives and discourses signify the sense of ‘nationness’ (p. 2). He indicates that narration holds culture as the most powerful and constructive position, as cultures have ‘normalizing tendencies’ that are produced “in the name of national interest”, while narrations establish the cultural boundaries of meaning of a nation (pp. 3-4).

Postmodernism, as a philosophy, challenges meta-narratives<sup>iii</sup> to individually shape truth and reality based on personal experience. The concept of multiculturalism as an articulation of difference can thus be tied to postmodernism, as it concerns the removal of power from authority that ignores difference in favour of a superficial and homogenous society (Kraidy, 2002, p. 13). As an identity philosophy, postmodernism can open limited notions of Canadian identity against the fixed culture prescribed by the state, because “postmodernism sets up essentialism as the enemy” (Radhakrishnan, 1995, p. 317). According to Lyotard (1984), narratives “determine criteria of competence... thus define what has the right to be said and done in the culture in question...” (p. 23). Canadian discourses act as meta-narratives creating a representation of cultural identity to which the population ascribes.

Identity, as the main concept within the research, refers to the notion of self-identification as well as a means of identifying others, and the means by which others define an individual. Thiel and Coate (2010) describe identity as “the need for a sense of “self” in relation to those around oneself and recognition of the legitimacy of that identity in society” as a basic human desire (p. vii). According to Hall (1996), the postmodern subject’s identity

is considered to have no fixed, essential or permanent identity, but becomes a fluid process in which identity is transformed continuously but can be influenced by representations in cultural systems (p. 598). Bhabha (1990b) discusses narratives as constructing cultural and national ideology of identity, and Hall (1990) asserts that there is a closure within representation as it naturalizes ideas of identity. When an ideology becomes naturalized, it becomes a dominant common sense, and often goes unquestioned.

To what extent then is identity formed using narratives through constructed common sense representations? For culture, Bhabha (1990a) asserts that an individual's identity embodies a space of no fixity, and refers to cultural hybridity as a consciousness<sup>iv</sup>. Identification is manifested through experiences, not on fixed, inherent cultural characteristics. The idea of a shared cultural identity thus emanates from a person's subjective consciousness and not predefined qualities. Hall (1996) states, "...we project "ourselves" into cultural identities and at the same time internalize their meanings and values, making them "part of us"..." (pp. 597-598). Culture consists of maps of meaning that allow us to make sense of the world. However, meaning is ambiguous until the individual subject makes sense of it. Thus, representations give meaning through individual perspective, and culture is central for meaning to arise out of these shared conceptual maps (Hall, 1997, p. 9).

Hall (1992) describes ethnicity as a term that "acknowledges the place of history, language, and culture in the subjectivity of identity; all discourse is placed, positioned, and situated" (p. 257). He describes the politics of ethnicity as predicated on difference, and as the crucial part of our subjectivities that give us a sense of who we are (p. 258). In many parts of the world, and particularly the West, individuals are more inclined to refer to

“nation” for themselves and refer to “ethnic” for immigrant peoples such as the term “ethnic minority” - creating differentiating politics (Ibrahim, 2011, p. 12)

Conflicts in national identity can be understood through the discussion of cultural discourse, as culture is the primary way by which we make sense of, and give meaning to, the world (Hall, 1997, p. 9). Hall (1996) describes national cultures not as unified, but as constituting a discursive tool that represents the difference of the individual or the population as the unity of identity. Deep internal cleavages or differences are only united through exercising different forms of cultural power, yet “national identities continue to be represented as unified”. One way that has been used to unify national identities is “to represent them as the underlying culture of “one people” (p. 617). However, social identities consist of many discursive practices that are complex and heterogeneous and thus cannot be formulated on social totality (McLellan and Richmond, 1994, pp. 668, 669). An ongoing interaction and negotiation between the agent and context stimulates certain identity forms in certain contexts (Schachter, 2005, p. 390). Postmodernism challenges the totality of a Canadian culture and the boundaries set by the state; however, what are the implications of citizenship in a diverse nation-state?

The analysis of Canadian citizenship is a debate that has resurfaced alongside migration and global connectivity. Citizenship itself contains tensions between inclusion and exclusion (Bloemraad et al., 2008, p. 155). According to Abu-Laban, (2004) the meaning of formal Canadian citizenship is undergoing challenges with implications for substantive rights and belonging. Abu-Laban (2004) indicates that the nature of citizenship “presumes insiders and outsiders, which may be why so many analysts have difficulty conceiving of a “world citizenship” despite talk of globalization” (p. 18).

In a multicultural nation-state, “the large number and diverse origins of international migrants increasingly challenge long-held notions of citizenship within nation-state borders” (Bloemraad et al., 2008, p. 154). Multicultural settings challenge existing concepts of singular, discursive representations of identity and citizenship. To what extent then do fixed discursive representations of identity need to be problematized in order to account for the multiplicity of cultural identities within nation-states?

### **Research Questions**

The questions guiding this research are as follows:

- To what degree do Canadian multiculturalism and Quebec interculturalism frameworks intervene in the meaning-making process of cultural and national identities of émigrés in both English Canada and Quebec?
- To what degree do multiculturalism and interculturalism take into consideration human agency and fluidity in national and cultural identity experiences, which may set their limitations?
- Are multicultural and intercultural policies creating conditions of equality and rights among all cultural groups within the nation-state’s boundaries?

To answer these questions, this research analyzes literature on the multiculturalism and interculturalism policies and examines the portrayal of cultural identity in Canada in an effort to interpret the social and political implications of Canadian identity formation. The literature compares multiculturalism and interculturalism and outlines discourses with anticipated objectives of the policies to shed light on the strengths and weaknesses of Canada’s political frameworks for diversity management. The analysis uncovers that there is potential for a more inclusive notion of Canadian identity and citizenship.

To address the degree to which policies and Canadian citizenship consider human agency and the fluidity of identity<sup>v</sup>, this research presents an analysis of Census of Canada questions and demonstrates: first, that the literature on the policies essentializes identity into specific categories of group experiences, marginalizing émigrés; second, that the questionnaires in the Census limit the space available to respond to questions accounting for fluid identity experiences, which are categorized and fixed, limiting representation of national and cultural identity. The analysis of the data demonstrates how current notions of citizenship create obstacles to equality among a heterogeneous population in Canada.

### **Methodology**

Investigating the postmodern concept and new conditions of identity formation requires a methodological approach that fosters the examination of culture as a primary element of meaning through shared conceptual maps, involving the construction of representations becoming naturalized, and fixing constructed representation through ideologies (Hall, 1997). Indeed, this is one of the Cultural Studies approaches. As identity can be constitutive of dominant discourses in society, it becomes necessary to deconstruct and consider one's environment within the dynamic of identity formation; in this case, to consider race and the representation of race within Canadian multiculturalist frameworks. These external interventions play a large role in the mental construct of how identity is categorized and conceptualized to fix meaning, creating binary oppositions.

Social, political, and economic influences of multiculturalist policies in Canadian society serve as a tool to compare individuals of ethnic backgrounds against White mainstream Canadian culture. Identity will be measured as various characteristics that individuals tie themselves to as their self-definition and life experience.

The formation and implementation of multiculturalism and interculturalism policies are not only impacted by the needs and desires of the population, but create a set of cultural ideologies and discourses. These external interventions directly and indirectly play a role in how identification is categorized and conceptualized to fix meaning.

The research uses qualitative approaches that illustrate the social context around Canadian cultural and national narratives, and the policies embedded in society to understand identity discourses (Neuman and Robson, 2012, p. 84). A qualitative approach allows for a deeper analysis of cultural discourses, in this case in Canada and Quebec, through the discursive analysis of the ways in which the concepts of multiculturalism and

interculturalism police social reality. A comparative and interpretive research approach is mobilized to investigate their implementation as a policy. In so doing, the two-part research first conceptually distinguishes multiculturalism from interculturalism as Canada's major diversity management framework, using secondary sources. These were also used to conduct an analysis on ideological identity implications of émigrés within Canada's diversity population vis-à-vis Canada-Quebec national narratives (Neuman and Robson, 2012, pp. 307-309).

The research then explores the concept of citizenship to generate an empirical example of Canadian identity challenges, using an analysis of questionnaires from the Census of Canada<sup>vi</sup>. According to Statistics Canada<sup>vii</sup> (2012), the purpose of the Census is to provide information about demographic and social characteristics of Canada, such as housing, education, and employment, and in particular which ethnic or cultural group a subject and their ancestors belong to<sup>viii</sup>.

The development of multiculturalism and interculturalism are designed to meet the needs of the Canadian citizens, and reflect their characteristics in order to ensure the entire population (citizenry) has access to equal opportunities. Indeed, citizenship is a legally binding and an institutionalized representation of being Canadian. This second analysis challenges the static notion of Canadian citizenship in a nation-state with competing national discourses, and substantiates the claims of discourses surrounding multiculturalism and interculturalism through the citizenship markers in the Census of Canada.

The five markers of citizenship from the analysis of the Census questions were: (1) culture; (2) economic; (3) education; (4) origin (national and immigrant); and (5) social markers of citizenship. These markers are arbitrary but inspired by the literature and they are used here as a tool or guideline to assist in making sense of where frameworks are derived<sup>ix</sup>.

A mixed methodological approach is used for the analysis of the Census questionnaires specifically, using a discursive content analysis. The content analysis allowed the research to analyze the structure of the questions within the markers of citizenship and the meaning that was implicated within how questions were communicated by the government, while the discourse analysis was used to relate the content into the context of society, such as discourses of identity for multiculturalism and interculturalism.

From the questions in the Census, markers emerged as units of analysis and further individual units or codes (of observations), which operationalized the units of analysis<sup>x</sup>. Following Babbie (2004), the codes were used to describe the units of analysis, which conceptualized citizenship, and the codes operationalized the markers as the units of analysis (p. 314). Completing a discourse analysis on the content of the Census applied the impact of the questions in relation to existing discourses in society - the relationship between the subjects, and the social structure. This approach considered the language in the content in the context of the society, in order to understand the relation between discourse, power, and dominance that produces social inequality (McKenna, 2004, p. 10).

### **Data Collection**

The Census of Canada questionnaires were analyzed to uncover the production of identity politics, ideologies, and power relations within how questions are structured, as an indication of how identity is conceptualized by Canadian institutions. The questionnaires were traced from 1971, as it is the year that the liberal government first introduced multiculturalism into the Canadian political sphere, and where the bulk of the theoretical literature begins. Since then, cultural and diversity management themes and agendas have grown as political priorities in Canada. Questions posed in the Census related to identity

markers created a representation of identity experiences in Canada. The questions relevant to Canadian identity qualified the notion of citizenship and are reflected in the categories of the markers. Based on these markers, the research categorized questions that created observations from the Census applying to citizenship (Babbie, 2004, p. 95).

In order to have a reasonably sized analysis that does not surpass the scope of the research, the coding and analysis focuses on the reporting of three generations of Census questionnaires within the forty-year span of the analysis. The 1971 questionnaire is relevant as it is the first generation of questions and marked the introduction of multiculturalism as a means of diversity management into the Canadian cultural and political agenda. The 1991 questionnaire marked the midpoint of the forty-year span of analysis. Lastly, the 2006 questionnaire was chosen, as it is the most recent long form questionnaire from the Census that could depict (in more detail), the vision of Canadian citizenship<sup>xi</sup>. Together, the three generations create a representation and evolution of the time span and suggest ways in which identity has been, and is now being, represented in Canada.

### **Challenges of Data Collection**

The first challenge to collecting data from the Census was to determine which categories reflect citizenship from the questionnaires. The second challenge was to determine which questions should be classified under the appropriate category. The first challenge is addressed by looking at the questions as a whole, setting out criteria for the markers that are suitable and most relevant to the appropriate category, while also remaining consistent with the criteria.

Another challenge was the amount of data drawn from questions, which would result in a content analysis too large for the scope of the research. As a result, the research focused

on three generations of Census questionnaires: 1971, 1991, and 2006. Each represents a relevant time period in the scope of this study. Furthermore, the units of observation (the codes) are introduced by marking the reoccurring themes within each marker to create a comprehensible analysis.

### **Structural Limitations of this Investigation**

Multiculturalism as a concept is relevant to themes of religion, gender, sexuality etc., encompassing groups that have been commonly marginalized. In the case of investigating cultural identity, the research focused on themes of culture, nationality, ethnicity, and citizenship. Aboriginal groups also raise challenges to the cultural policies in Canada; however, for the scope of this research, Canadian cultural challenges will be discussed through the Francophone Quebec cultural discourse vis-à-vis the rest of Anglophone Canada, without the integration of the complexities of Aboriginal issues.

French speaking Canadians exist outside of Quebec culture and English speaking Canadians exist inside Quebec, and likely experience linguistic and cultural challenges in Canada. However, this research will investigate the Quebec Francophone group within the framework of Anglophone Canada, as there is a history of cultural duality and yearning for Quebec recognition from the time of colonization by France and Britain.

The framework of this research is predicated on equality, and diverse cultural autonomy as a desire for the Canadian population by individuals living in the country, and by the government institution. However, nowhere has it been validated that the general population wants cultural rights for all, nor whether the government is aware of what this entails. Should émigrés adapt, integrate, and assimilate to satisfy the host-country's traditions, practices, and habits? Is negotiating ones identity a sacrifice that is required for a

sense of belonging in an émigré nation-state? Notwithstanding such questions, there is a need to deconstruct naturalized identity politics to uncover hidden or covert inequalities within the population.

**Overview**

In chapter one, the research examines the concept of multiculturalism as a tool to highlight conditions of marginalized social groups. Upon outlining the genealogy of its emergence as a state policy in Canada, it is concluded that multiculturalism is understood differently in different contexts. Some literature demonstrates that integration is a priority within Canadian multicultural frameworks, but the policy typecasts identity features within its role of policing cultural diversity. As a result, this creates unequal relations between mainstream cultural groups, and marginalized émigrés in society.

Chapter two provides an historical overview of Quebec's cultural struggle for recognition in Canada. Quebec's version of civic citizenship is discussed as a means to strengthen Francophone cultural identity. The power of cultural narratives is displayed in this chapter as more important for policies than for the practicality of how they are implemented. Lastly, this chapter postulates that interculturalism and multiculturalism are not different from each other in application, but in the narratives they encompass.

Chapter three incorporates the analysis of Canadian citizenship through the Census questionnaires to contribute to an empirical comparison of the literature. Despite having citizenship, émigrés are still categorized as immigrants, as seen through the Census. The analysis also concludes that the conceptualization of identity as a representation of citizenship provides limited, fixed notions, and articulations that do not take into consideration the complexity of identity, which includes Canada's challenge of cultural duality and of émigrés.

The conclusion suggests a paradigm shift in the conceptualization of citizenship and identity, to encompass transnational and transcultural notions to better account for the fluidity of a diverse population.

## **Chapter 1 – The case of Anglophone Canada**

Multiculturalism has been known under many pretences around the world as a result of and in response to culturally diverse populations. Indeed, Canada's diverse population of émigrés stimulated the creation of multiculturalism as a diversity management policy, with attempts to institutionally govern cultural relations. It is a process of categorization in which, as a matter of policy, it polices and organizes life in terms of categories. Research suggests that there are different understandings of what kinds of results multiculturalism produces, that there is a lack of clarity of what it can propose as a concept, and what its implications are in the Canadian context as a policy.

The following section introduces the investigation of multiculturalism in the Canadian context by discussing cultural identity debates surrounding the Canadian multicultural environment. Multiculturalism is then outlined as a conceptual system of ideas to shed light on its theoretical emergence as a tool for marginalized social groups before its implementation as a Canadian policy. This chapter subsequently provides a perspective of how multiculturalism has been implemented around the world and the different ways it can be applied in national policy, which is preceded by a historical account of multiculturalism's evolution as a domestic Canadian policy. This is followed by a discussion of multiculturalism's existence in Canada's liberal democracy to question whether the policy can be applied theoretically in accordance with liberal democratic ideals. Lastly, this chapter reflects on the Canadian experience<sup>xii</sup> regarding the practical application of the multiculturalism policy and implications on the Canadian population.

### **Canadian Multicultural Challenges**

As the world displays more culturally diverse settings, the reaction to diversity and the models that emerge as a result become crucial to the harmony and cohesion of a nation-state. This includes how émigrés position themselves within an existing nation, state, and culture, how they are accepted, and whether multicultural citizens can exist equally while upholding universal rights and equality for all cultures living in Canada.

The multiculturalism policy remains a tool and a priority in Canadian cultural discourse, especially intertwined in the political context despite its convoluted nature. As a government framework, multiculturalism is subject to doubts, disagreements and debates over internal inconsistencies of objectives, premises, processes and outcomes; it is also characterized as being obscurely difficult to measure (Fleras, 2009, p. 2). This raises the necessity of investigating multiculturalism to understand the government policy that is reverent to the Canadian public, as it aims to achieve balanced, non-discriminatory cultural co-existence with a foundation in a version of equality for cultural groups.

### **As a Concept**

Multiculturalism has roots that span beyond the Canadian political context as a tool for diversity management; the concept is manifested on a larger scale as a theoretical approach for analyzing difference. In its most basic context, multiculturalism can be described as another way of using knowledge, often with several disciplines, to highlight social aspects of history that have been neglected (Trotman, 2002, p. ix). According to Trotman (2002), concepts of race, class, culture, gender, and ethnicity are the driving themes of the approach, which advocate respect and dignity for groups that have been neglected. He asserts that multiculturalism's role is to raise consciousness about the past, to examine

history and social themes, to reject the racist cultural past, and to investigate deeper human understanding of a multicultural society (p. xvi). Thus, as a concept, multiculturalism historically examines marginalized social groups' relationships to dominant society without omitting historical contributions and struggles faced by minoritized groups.

Fillion (2008) describes the multicultural world as one that is experiencing an *observation* of an increase in diversity, such that we are placing our observations within a pre-existing framework of reference that is constructed out of our patterns of assumptions and modes of assertions of an environment that we have naturalised (p. 4). For Fillion (2008), stating that the world is increasingly diverse is to proclaim that unfamiliarity is occurring within our framework of experience, and that we are able to recognize these elements as unfamiliar while not understanding them (p.5). The observations made by society in general reveal assumptions about how the world is perceived and contributes to the way the world is shaped (p. 3). These constructed assumptions create a normative framework that plays an interpretive role in our conceptualizations of reality. Thus, according to Fillion (2008), the focus of the present should be understood not in isolation, but within a context of a past-present-future complex, by distinguishing different roles of *knowledge*, *structured contact*, and *anticipation* (p. 11). These principles encourage the contextualization of social and ideological claims that are often simplified and accepted - specifically discourses in this case - that emerge from government policies. To what extent then should normative assumptions be deconstructed to look deeper at how we shape the world? Do these assumptions not subsequently impact the outcome of knowledge in our lives?

Much like Fillion (2008), Fleras (2009) describes multiculturalism as seeking to interrogate and deconstruct dominant systems of meaning, absolutist claims to moral authority, and hegemonic versions of knowledge (p. 4). For Fleras (2009), multiculturalism

is a start to a counter-hegemonic new world order centred around diversity discourses, including immigrant-driven demographic changes, an emergent politics of difference, a support of multiculturalism as the blueprint necessary for cooperation and coexistence, and the “codification of multicultural principles into an inclusive governance” (p.2). This notion of multiculturalism encourages acknowledgment of different levels of meaning in order to uncover naturalised discourses - a way to contest dominant and limiting ideologies in state institutions.

The multiculturalism framework is a movement, according to Parekh (2006), who states “...these movements thus form a part of the wider struggle for recognition of identity and difference or, more accurately, of identity-related differences” (p1). Parekh (2006) narrows in on the multicultural movement as one that stems from identity differences and the struggle for equal recognition without disenfranchising or alienating members of a nation-state. Parekh (2006) adds that individuals involved in the minority empowerment movement cry out for more than just tolerance from the greater society, they require mutual recognition. For society to simply tolerate minorities would concede the validity of society’s disapproval of the recognition they demand. These politics of recognition emerge as an element of multiculturalism that considers identity and the relationship between minorities and marginalized groups with anyone outside of what is considered a normative framework (pp. 2-3).

For Kymlicka (2007), granting minority rights emerges as an approach to address the political challenges of identity tension in multicultural states. The priority of minority rights are resurfacing as one of the key issues of the international community’s solution to growing tensions between ethnic groups as “ethnic conflict came to be seen as a serious threat to international peace and security” (Kymlicka 2007 p. 587). Ensuring that minority groups

receive universal human rights is central to Kymlicka's response to these challenges. Indeed, acknowledging minority groups assists in managing ethnic identities by granting minority rights to avoid conflict. However do these conditions reflect a universal equality for minority groups?

Although Kymlicka argues that minority rights are considered important to the multiculturalism movement, Parekh (2006) contends that multiculturalism is not about minorities. That would imply that the majority culture is uncritically accepted and used to judge the claims and define the rights of minorities, which does not fall under the ideals of universal rights and equality; individuals remain labelled as minority. Parekh (2006) asserts, "Multiculturalism is about the proper terms of relationship between different cultural communities" (p. 13). A regulated relationship between different cultural communities for Parekh (2006) brings about a balanced relationship where rights or acceptance are not granted from a larger more dominant cultural group validating what rights are and should be administered to minorities. Does Kymlicka's approach to minority rights respond to identity issues without addressing the deep roots of the politics of difference? The formation of ethnic and minority rights in this respect does not stem from an ideal for universal rights and equality, but from a standpoint of prevention or solution to ethnic conflict in which resolutions are administered to a minority group.

According to Maalouf, (2003) understanding cultural differences, recognition, respect, and reciprocity are required for equal coexistence of identities in a country with multiple ethnic backgrounds (p. 42). If all cultures are not acknowledged as equal constituents of a greater nation, society is left with an asymmetrical power relationship, often prescribed by structural governing policies. Maalouf's argument would also disqualify instating minority rights as a solution to confront diversity challenges. The need for equal

recognition is required for communities to have a sense of cultural belonging (Bhargava, 2002, p. 78).

Multiculturalism as a concept can be summarized as a way to address cleavages in identity. It is a tool specifically for the identification of minority groups to be pushed from the margins of society. It can represent a different way to use knowledge, a counter-hegemonic framework that challenges the institutionalization of a nation-state or culture (encompassing postmodern ideals), and can reveal essentialized and limiting discourses embedded in society. Multiculturalism advocates for equal recognition and balanced reciprocity for marginalized groups, eliminating token differences, and instating equality for the widespread participation of marginalized groups as part of the larger culture.

The creation of multiculturalism began as a society-building idea with noble design aimed to create an inclusive society and attitudes comfortable with difference, but the result, according to some, was intentions that have transformed into a flashpoint for tension (Fleras, 2009, pp. 1-2). However, multiculturalism's elusive and intangible characteristics result in an abstract notion that is difficult to operationalize and empirically describe, and thus can be subject to interpretations for how it is applied.

### **Different Applications**

There are different discursive articulations and uses of multiculturalism that stem from varying positions; the concept has different meanings depending on where it is being applied, by whom, and for what reason (Bannerji, 2000, p. 5). Multiculturalism has been discussed and applied in various approaches in many parts of the world. The multiculturalist movement first appeared where: distinct cultural groups historically existed; where the belief was in a single national culture to which all citizens should assimilate; and, where national

identity was faced with unfamiliar challenges from long established or new arrivals that could not, or would not assimilate (Parekh, 2006, p. 5). The latter can plague any nation and is not bound by a certain time period. However, with the global movement of people and information, as well as the cultural confusion that accompanies migration, the arrival of new citizens creates a heightened challenge for cultural relations in the present day. The application of multiculturalism as a way to combat such circumstances differs from one country to another, and is erroneously perceived to be the same around the world (Karim 2009, p. 701).

The most common comparison of multicultural nations can be made between Canada and Australia because of their similar historical characteristics. Both Canada and Australia are Commonwealth nations, with federal parliamentary systems, and are classic examples of white settler societies (Turner, 2006, p. 611). According to Turner (2006), the importance of multiculturalism in Australia was the positive response to diversity. In other words, to be against multiculturalism meant you were against culture itself (p. 612). It became a large part of Australian politics and culture, and is accompanied by a positive undertone within nation-state discourses. The same reaction toward multiculturalism was observed in Canada; the general public accepted multiculturalism as a fair way to manage the diverse ethnic and cultural population, and it is a fundamental part of Canadian national identity. Conversely, multiculturalism in the United States was initially directed towards the black community for political integration, and in Europe, it was applied towards religious diversity (Turner, 2006, p. 612). Thus, multiculturalism has been applied in different areas of the world in ways that would accommodate specific, prominent identity conflicts.

Kymlicka (2007) identifies and distinguishes between two levels in which multiculturalism is presently dispersed internationally: first is the “diffusion of the *political*

*discourse of multiculturalism*” which refers to policymaking, Non-Governmental Organizations, and scholars, and emphasizes the importance of accommodating diversity (p. 585); second is “the codification of multiculturalism in *international legal norms*”, which is in regards to the declarations of minority rights. Kymlicka (2007) notes that each nation requires preconditions in order for the international model of multiculturalism to be successful (p. 585). However, each part of the world holds a unique dynamic of cultures, making it difficult to apply a universal model of multiculturalism as it impacts the population on a micro level.

As Canadian multiculturalism is discerned as a moral position, and as the description of a state of affairs, its origins as a policy can be traced back to the 1970s and 1980s in North America (Turner, 2006, p. 611).

### **The Emergence of Multiculturalism as a Canadian Policy**

While Switzerland was the first country to coin the term “multiculturalism” Canada was first to enshrine it as an official policy (Karim, 2009, p. 701). In the Canadian context, multiculturalism is used as a descriptive term and “a set of programmatic measures” conducive to the state’s view of a collection of cultures; it becomes a reflection of the nation-states’ priorities (Benessaieh, 2010, p. 17).

Maxwell Yalden<sup>xiii</sup> (2011) suggests that multiculturalism began with the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, which was one of the first acts established under Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson’s new government in 1963. The Commission was required to suggest steps to be taken to develop the Canadian Federation on the basis of equal partnership between the “two founding races” (English and French), while taking into account the contributions of other ethnic groups. It was clear that biculturalism or “two

nations” with equal partnership took precedence over “other ethnic groups” for the Commissioners, and was a prominent feature of the Canadian political scene, particularly in the elections in 1968. However, the Commissioners’ travels across the country found biculturalism and the idea of “two founding nations” had limited appeal in the west.

Non-English and non-French who played a role in the settlement of Canada found it difficult to cede to the recognition of the English and French as the founders of Canada (Yalden, 2011, p. 6). The Commission’s Preliminary Report thus contained one of the earliest uses of multiculturalism in a public document, thwarting biculturalism and the notion of English and French races as founding the Canadian nation. Multiculturalism progressed, as did substantial immigration, particularly in Canada’s largest cities, creating “profound changes to our demographic and social makeup...” (Yalden, 2011, p. 7).

The development of Canadian multiculturalism in the 1960s and 1970s is what Taylor (2012) describes as essentially the dethroning of the existing Anglo-normative understanding of that time, which aimed to clarify that belonging to the Canadian culture was for all, regardless of ethnic or cultural background. This sharply distinguished one’s culture of origin from Canadian citizenship, including in Canadian legislation, which identified that Canada had no official ancestral culture (p. 417). The motivation of the change, according to Taylor (2012), was that “a multiracial Canada is much easier to build under the philosophy of multiculturalism than it would have been under the older outlook” of the Anglo-normative theory (p. 417). Multiculturalism would eliminate the possibility of a cultural and national duality in Canada.

Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau officially put forward multiculturalism, within a bilingual framework, as a policy goal in October 1971 in the House of Commons (Karim, 2009, p.702). Boekestijn’s (1988) essay quotes an excerpt from the 1971 House of Commons

Debates in Ottawa stating: “... *there is no official culture nor does any ethnic group take precedence over the other . . . Canadian identity will not be undermined by multiculturalism. Indeed we believe that cultural pluralism is the very essence of Canadian identity. Every ethnic group has the right to preserve and develop its own culture and values within the Canadian context . . . a policy of multiculturalism must be a policy for all Canadians*” (p. 97).

This excerpt represents the ideologies proclaimed in the House that propelled the multiculturalism discourse in Canada. It reveals that under multiculturalism, no ethnic or cultural group would be privileged; rather, all groups would be encouraged to preserve and develop their own culture, and would be considered within the same ranking. At the same time, the Canadian identity would not be compromised by the existence of other cultures. Instead, every ethnicity in Canada shall be treated equally. The complexity of applying the theoretical objective of maintaining Canadian identity, while attempting to offer ethnic and cultural autonomy, is described as a set of nuances in this excerpt. The dominion of the Canadian identity can be found in the 1971 statements, while categorizing all other cultural and ethnic experiences within the same status. As 1971 initiated the idea of multiculturalism, Karim (2009) indicates that it was in the 1980s that the bureaucratic structures dedicated to implementing the policy grew, along with the budgetary allocations (p.703).

Almost two decades after the policy was first initiated in the House of Commons, the official *Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988* was born under then Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, which is said to have “inaugurated the era of strong multicultural policy” (Ferguson, Langlois & Roberts, 2009, p. 85). It was then that Canadian multiculturalism was pushed forward and became intertwined within the Canadian social fabric, forming the era which we are still experiencing - multiculturalism as a major element of Canadian cultural

and national identity and citizenship. A current look at the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 2013* indicates that “the Constitution of Canada recognizes the importance of preserving and enhancing the multicultural heritage of Canadians...” (p. 1). The multiculturalism policy of the Government of Canada is declared as a “...fundamental characteristic of the Canadian heritage and identity...” and that it “...provides an invaluable resource in the shaping of Canada’s future...” (p. 3).

It was the federal government’s responsibility to develop and implement the policy by establishing programs that would respond to the cultural diversity of Canada’s population (Karim, 2009, p. 703). According to a statement from Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada<sup>xiv</sup> (1990), “the Act commits the Government of Canada to assist communities and institutions in bringing about equal access and participation for all Canadians in the economic, social, cultural, and political life of the nation” (p.1). Equal access is essential to creating a sense of belonging without alienation, allowing émigrés to have the same opportunities as other Canadians. This statement displays the federal government’s commitment to and prioritization of active participation from all groups in Canada. But how is this to be achieved, specifically with a diverse cultural population that is growing, with different ethnicities, cultures, languages, etc.?

Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) (2012b) states that, “Canadian multiculturalism is fundamental to our belief that all citizens are equal... that all citizens can keep their identities, can take pride in their ancestry and have a sense of belonging”. CIC (2012a, para. 1) addresses policy debates and asserts that multiculturalism encourages ethnic harmony and “discourages ghettoization, hatred, discrimination and violence”, and states that multiculturalism “has led to higher rates of naturalization than ever before” and that no ethnicities are pressured to assimilate or give up their culture. Karim (2009) summarizes his

interpretation of Canadian multiculturalism's several policy dimensions as: "...designed to foster immigrant integration, improve race relations, reduce communal conflict, encourage good citizenship, support national cohesion, and enjoin cultural assimilation" (p. 701). Thus, the Canadian government regards "integration" into the majority culture as a priority under the Canadian multiculturalism framework. However mutual recognition and reciprocity<sup>xv</sup> is neglected as cultures are encouraged to participate in one majority national culture, which creates a fine line between what is considered integration vis-à-vis assimilation. To what extent then does integration foster equality?

### **Multiculturalism Survival in a Liberal Democracy**

Modern societies are increasingly confronted with the demand for recognition and accommodation of cultural differences for the identity of minority groups, which Kymlicka (1996) identifies as the challenge of multiculturalism (p. 10). However, he states "minority rights cannot be subsumed under the category of human rights"; thus devising a liberal approach to minority rights (p. 5). Kymlicka (1996) promotes and defends the idea of liberal-multiculturalism as an evolution that is built upon human rights and liberal norms (p. 586).

In the early 1990s, political theorists began to address multiculturalism and question its consistency with ideal theories of justice (Kymlicka, 2011, p. 7). Kymlicka (2011) illustrates his own theory of liberal multiculturalism in Figure 1. As an advocate of minority rights and liberal democratic multiculturalism, he aligns it with core liberal democratic values and claims. Kymlicka (2011) argues, "...states can adopt multiculturalism policies to fairly recognize the legitimate interests of minorities in their identity and culture without eroding core liberal-democratic values" (p. 6).

Kymlicka’s (2011) thesis parallels core liberal democratic values with Multiculturalism Policies (MCPs). As shown in Figure 1, the left column presents examples of the sorts of policies adopted within Western democracies since the 1960s. In the right column, Kymlicka identifies a list of three core liberal democratic values. Kymlicka’s (2011) concept of liberal multiculturalism is based on the premise that countries can adopt one or more of the MCPs on the left without jeopardizing the values on the right (p. 7).

Multiculturalism policies (MCPs)	Core liberal-democratic values
(1) Re: Immigrants - Ethnic representation in media - Religious accommodations - Funding of ethnic organizations - Multicultural/mother-tongue education - Affirmative action	(1) Civil and political liberties - Freedom of speech, conscience, assembly - Right to effective political participation
(2) Re: national minorities - Official language rights - Regional autonomy - Consociational power-sharing	(2) Equality of opportunity - To acquire skills - To gain employment
(3) Re: indigenous peoples - Land claims - Self-government rights - Customary law - Treaty rights	(3) Solidarity- Mutual respect - Redistribution

**Figure 1** - Formulating the liberal multicultural thesis. (Kymlicka, 2011, p. 6)

If Kymlicka’s MCPs are adopted, it appears that, on the surface, they would not jeopardize his conceptualization of core liberal-democratic values. However, there is a failure to acknowledge the power relations involved in implementing the MCPs at the institutional level by granting civil and political liberties, equality of opportunity, and solidarity rights to a population that is considered minority. Will granting rights change one’s position as a minority? Or does minority placement in society remain the same? The

complexity of this social relationship would further marginalize minorities, as part of the population is socially predisposed to natural privileges, while non-mainstream groups remain disenfranchised by the fact that their rights must be validated by an institution that also recognizes the group as different. Lastly, in the event that this theory is applicable, can Kymlicka's MCPs bridge the gap between policies into empirical, substantive applications of equality in social and cultural discourses? Or is multiculturalism unable to acknowledge individuals as different and equal within a liberal democratic structure?

Kenny (2004) states that recent major liberal thinkers question whether liberal democracy is compatible with claims and actions that are rooted in the discourse of individual identity such as multiculturalism. Theories of liberal democracy seem to only be able to manage aggregate groups within society. Democratic society as a framework encourages individuals to see themselves as having ties and commitments to these encompassing groups (Kenny, 2004, p. vii). Structuring the population into aggregate groups fails to acknowledge the politics of difference within identification and neglects human agency.

Haddock and Sutch (2003) attribute the growth of problems regarding multiculturalism to a question of universalist assumptions on which liberalism was built. The view of society as an "aggregation of atomic units" has become less plausible (p. 2). Within the discourse of diversity, there is a need to further recognize the individual within diverse cultural groups and consider the discourse of difference. Ergo the visibility of the theoretical gap in the implementation of the policy of multiculturalism would value individual rights and agency over democratic group retention.

As such, Haddock and Sutch (2003) discuss multicultural identity and rights as a complex circumstance that makes normative theorizing difficult, yet as practical agents,

individuals attempt to create a course of action through the labyrinth of possibilities (p.1).

Fleras (2009) acknowledges the same struggle and states that multiculturalism's impact on the population as a governing policy is faced with the challenge of balancing collective rights with individual freedom, establishing a framework for equality between groups, and not losing individual rights within groups (p. 4). The difficulty lies in the ability to empirically apply the abstract and theoretical concept while making it applicable to the subjective circumstances that characterize individuals in society.

Kymlicka's (2011) argument appears to provide a pragmatic outlook on the contribution and effect of Canadian multiculturalism, as seen through his MCPs with liberal values, his argument for minority rights, and his work on the international diffusion of multiculturalism. However, does this address the issue of discourse and power creating a controlled-experience for émigré minority groups? From the latter stems the complexity of outlining what multiculturalism means, and what it has achieved. Kymlicka's work touches the surface of multicultural issues to provide a temporary means to manage circumstances rather than acknowledging struggles for recognition from marginalized groups, which is arguably caused by limited conceptualizations of identity and a refusal to accept identity differences.

According to Taylor (2001), democracy embodies immense characteristics of homogeneity. Those who are not part of the people lack important reasons to feel compelled or tied by their national decisions, even having citizenship status. Taylor (2001) states that this appears easy to perceive with national or cultural minorities who feel left out of understanding the "polity as the expression of their nation, or agreed purpose, whatever it be" while the majority is positioned inside their level of comfort, which allows them the capacity for greater insight (p. 123). While citizens are legally entitled to equal opportunity

as per the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* and through the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, are these rights reflected in common discourses? Can the Act infuse treatment and feelings of belonging into the population?

We have seen that the nature of multiculturalism arguments is shaped by respective interpretations of the policy's objective. A generic model for multiculturalism has been presumed to be erroneous, and a clear objective and definition has yet to be applied with indications of a measurable outcome. Yet the concept has been promulgated as a policy. Moreover, granting individual's rights within a liberal democratic structure has been criticized, as a discourse of difference cannot be granted under the existing framework. Would it not be important then to investigate the theoretical gap between interpretations of multiculturalism and its application?

### **Canada's Experience with Multiculturalism**

Multiculturalism in Canada has evolved as a steady national icon that few political leaders dare to challenge (Fleras, 2009, p. 188). For over four decades, the multiculturalism policy has been a topic of discussion and debate in Canada; however, as indicated by Karim (2009), "we have often been talking past each other because of the varying interpretations that we have given to it" (p. 702).

For Garcea (2008), multiculturalism in Canada can be viewed from two perspectives: (1) the public policy of multiculturalism; and (2) the philosophy of multiculturalism (p. 142). As the policy of multiculturalism entails legalities protected under the law, the philosophy can be described as the ideals and discourses within societal relationships, whether between individuals, or between institutions and individuals. Thus, both the philosophy and the public

policy of multiculturalism embody two dimensions in which they impact social understanding.

Ongoing arguments indicate that the multiculturalist framework can be used to unite a world divided by cultural identities by managing the coexistence of individuals and groups from diverse backgrounds. Yet, there are fears that a multicultural response to immigration in particular, will “disrupt the social fabric, dilute national identities, imperil borders and security, and balkanize society into isolated and warring fragments” (Fleras, 2009, p. 202). Where does that leave minorities in the context of the Canadian population? Problems arise when naturalized dominant ideologies, as well as the values of cultural and ethnic minorities, come into apparent conflict (Karim, 2008, p. 60)<sup>xvi</sup>.

Pessimism can frequently be found as the undertone of Canadian multiculturalism arguments. Bannerji (2000) argues that in the West, “immigration” is often used as a euphemism for racist labour and citizenship policies. Immigration and multiculturalism have become a major element of election platforms for candidates and political parties. Bannerji (2000) describes it as a state-initiated business with complex legal and governing structures consisting of legislation, official policies, and administration (p. 15). Furthermore, the Canadian discourse of diversity is an ideology with its own political imperative in what is called multiculturalism (p. 55). Bhabha (1990a) contends that the notion of cultural diversity in liberal democracy is a limiting policy that lies in political principles used in circumstances of self-interest in the multiculturalist framework - a “mythology of progress” or containment from the dominant society (p. 209). He states, “multiculturalism represented an attempt to both respond to and control the dynamic process of the articulation of cultural difference, administering a *consensus* based on a norm that propagates cultural diversity” (Bhabha, 1990a, p. 208).

Multiculturalism becomes more than just a way of governing, but also a way to make sense of knowledge, and of how individuals construct their differences and their culture. Bannerji and Bhabha's notions of multiculturalism describe Canadian multiculturalist ideals as exploitative, racializing identity, and not accounting for the identity experience of individuals over groups, which limits discourses of identity and difference. Bannerji's (2000) position resembles Bhabha's "mythology of progress" as she describes Canadian multiculturalism as a "tool for the ruling class" (p. 2). Gutmann (1994) also criticizes public institutions, including government agencies and educational institutions, for failing to recognize or respect the particular cultural identities of citizens among multicultural democracies such as Canada (p. 3). As such, multiculturalism has been covertly exploited with claims of doing good for the greater country, acknowledging minorities by conferring rights and recognition, albeit self-interestedly. Although immigration has been a large part of the Canadian culture, Ibrahim (2011) also notes that Canada's immigration policy is largely, though not entirely, economically driven (p. 17). Karim (2009) adds that there are common complaints of politicians using multiculturalism for their own advantage (p. 704). In this regard, the multiculturalism policy not only lacks clarity in terms of what it is promoting and the impact left on cultural groups in Canada, but the objective of the policy, which would appear far from noble, contains enough rhetoric to frame the policy with such optimism as to attach it to a national identity, while it is misemployed at the institutional level.

The challenges identified by scholars in secondary sources evidently are not the arguments that surface in the official discourse of Canadian multiculturalism on the federal level, as per Kymlicka (2010). In a report compiled for Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Kymlicka (2010) notes that there are challenges confronting multiculturalism in Canada that are often ignored, and he speculates the need to reframe the debate in order to move forward

(p.5). He states that the impact of the social, economic, and political integration of immigrants is often debated, and critics argue that the outcome of the policy promotes “ghettoization and balkanization”, which encourages members of ethnic groups to look inward and emphasize the differences between groups, rather than their shared rights and identities as Canadian citizens (p.7). Thus, federal debates on multiculturalism differ from the scholarly debates of the politics behind the implementation of the policy.

Kymlicka (2010) notes that “the fact that Canada has officially defined itself as a multicultural nation means that immigrants are a constituent part of the nation that citizens feel pride in”. He states that ideally the policy serves as a link for native-born citizens to be in solidarity with immigrants, as well as minorities, that integration encompasses many dimensions and is high on the list of priorities (p. 9). Kymlicka’s (2010) resolution for multiculturalism debates would be to integrate segregated groups into the population, to connect ethnic groups to the dominant culture. However, to examine the semantics of Kymlicka’s argument, it seems he conflates integration into a cultural community as being a constituent of the community. It is unrealistic to believe that integration does not come without a dimension of assimilation, as there is a dominant cultural group to which minority groups must subscribe. Would it be possible to achieve the ‘integration’ of each part of society, as constituent members of the culture, with the existence of a larger, more dominant culture without influencing or engulfing elements of minority cultural groups? Karim (2009) questions integration, as several discourses “tend to interpret “integration” as the absorption of everyone into a monolithic culture” (p. 705).

According to Bokestijn (1988), cultural discourses in Canada, including the *Multiculturalism Act of 1988*, states that migrants are encouraged to preserve their identity; however, there is indeed a national Canadian identity. This message conveys that the

preservation of ethnic culture must take place in a Canadian context, sharing common concerns and values (p. 97). Boekestijn (1988) declares that regardless of efforts directed towards preserving ethnic identities, there was, and is, an overriding culture in Canada that obstructs the preservation of ethnic cultures.

The ideals of Canadian multiculturalism contain rhetoric that proclaim with pride that Canada *is*, proudly, a multicultural nation that respects different cultures, and is designed to provide universal equality and freedoms for everyone by preserving and celebrating cultural diversities. This can be described as Canada's attempt to institutionalize social justice and police cultural identities. With multiculturalism as a large part of the Canadian identity, we must ask ourselves what the policy is achieving in actuality, specifically regarding the politics of identity.

Boekestijn (1988) posed relevant questions in the 1980s regarding the implementation of multiculturalism, which arguably can still be applied today. Notable: "whether an explicit announcement and its implementations have any effect in changing relations between dominant and less powerful subgroups" (p. 97) (i.e. minorities). Although multiculturalism is accompanied with legal inferences of cultural equality, how far do these themes penetrate into cultural discourses? Boekestijn (1988) proceeds by making observations that can still be applicable today in a multicultural framework, by stating that "an intriguing problem is what limits must and can be set in such a policy" (p. 99). As a further example, he asks whether all minority languages should be taught in school, or whether members of minorities have the right to speak their native languages in court (Boekestijn, 1988, p. 99). Although these questions were posed decades ago, they remain relevant and in modern debates.

### **Interpretations and Observations of Canadian Multiculturalism**

Canadian culture in general has been notable for having providential multicultural relations embedded within the Constitution. Debates on Canadian identity arise within multiculturalism with the declaration of no official culture, and paradoxically a need to encourage integration for ethnic minorities into the socioeconomic and political sphere.

The research displays that the dynamic of socio-political and cultural relations are different in various countries. As such, a universal model of multiculturalism applied in different scenarios is questionable in its effectiveness. Taylor (2001) identifies downfalls taken up by philosophers, such as that there has been an excessive narrowing and unwarranted belief in a universal solution for the politics of multiculturalism, which has been oversimplified, under explained, and politically charged (p. 122). Moreover, the theoretical basis of multiculturalism has left it difficult to apply, and multiple versions have created an entanglement of possibilities with an outcome that remains debated in Canada. While some scholars argue against its effectiveness in a liberal democracy, others support a version of liberal multiculturalism that encourages ethnic integration as a response to balkanization.

Karim (2009) describes multiculturalism as a representation of an object understood differently by different people who remain in the dark about its many interpretations and use the same term but mean different things (p. 702). Literature has displayed that there are claims of multiculturalism as a policy for all ethnicities for equality and rights; however, deconstructing the émigré minority experience in Canada does not necessarily reflect a positive outlook. At the federal level, public departments and politicians are not debating the same issues and topics as in scholarly literature. It is important to capitalize on identity similarities, while acknowledging differences, without imposing and limiting identity discourses.

Individuals placed outside society's norms naturally desire to be recognized and legitimized as constitutive members. The influence that Canadian ideologies can have on émigrés plays a role in how identity becomes legitimized or recognized by the greater population. The emergence of multiculturalism as a policy characterizes the necessity of providing a configuration that applies a model to the growing condition of ethnic, national, and cultural differences. Would the challenge then be to build a model that can sustain individual rights within groups, while maintaining equality between groups?

The next chapter will explore Canada's succeeding diversity management policy for the province of Quebec: interculturalism. The aim is to uncover how Quebec's interculturalism model can be understood by examining the same elements of identity, equality, and rights for émigrés. The similarities and differences of multiculturalism and interculturalism will be highlighted to determine the effectiveness of both policies with regards to their objectives, and how they impact cultural discourses in Canada.

## Chapter 2 – The Case of Francophone Quebec

Ongoing constitutional debates regarding the division of power and the institutional separation and segmentation between Canada and Quebec have created divides in cultural discourses in Canada. Indeed, Quebec can be considered a self-proclaimed nation within the multinational Canadian state. Furthermore, the growth in the diversity of the population in Quebec raises challenges in cultural relations for émigrés within Quebec society. Both these factors contributed to the creation of the interculturalism policy.

The importance of examining the objectives of multiculturalism and interculturalism is to better understand how they are implemented in the Canadian context. The previous chapter examined the theoretical basis of the concept of multiculturalism as a contestation of normative homogenous identity representations in the nation. The emergence of multiculturalism as a policy in the Canadian social and political context was also examined, including complications of granting equal rights to ethnocultural minorities and the cultural majorities, as well as the impact of the policy on cultural discourses of identity. This chapter examines Quebec's interculturalism policy to understand some distinctions with multiculturalism, the political and social history behind the formation of interculturalism, and both policies' positions and relevance within Canadian cultural discourses.

The chapter first introduces general terms of the relationship between Canadian multiculturalism and Quebec interculturalism. Next, the chapter will examine Francophone Quebec national struggles in Canada by reviewing a brief history of Quebec's battle to maintain an independent culture. Canadian constitutional debates and Quebec's language rights are then outlined as contributing to the creation of interculturalism. This will be followed by a discussion of Quebec's immigration initiatives, as they have played a role in the province's French language and cultural sustenance. It is also important to address

Quebec's notions of civic citizenship over ethnic citizenship. This aspect is identified as Quebec's idea of diversity and what is important to the province's cultural discourse. The chapter then examines the role of cultural narrations in public perceptions of cultural policies, and how these narratives play a role in their implementation. This will be followed by a discussion of common themes that display sentiments of the marginalized population to try and capture émigrés' experiences in Quebec. Lastly, interculturalism will be compared to multiculturalism for policy similarities and differences within the Canadian context of identity.

### **Interculturalism and Multiculturalism in Quebec**

Two distinct nation-building policies emerged at the federal and provincial levels as a result of different frameworks for managing diverse populations. Quebec instituted interculturalism as their policy for cultural diversity as an alternative to Canadian multiculturalism. Although multiculturalism and interculturalism formations stem from the same underlying cause - diversity management - there remains a disparity surrounding the discourses of each concept, which is juxtaposed in the way they are implemented.

While the Canadian Multiculturalism Act promotes the existence of cultural differences with no official culture, Quebec has a longstanding agenda of maintaining Francophone culture with fears of losing a distinct French identity. Some critics of multiculturalism argue that the interculturalism model evolved in opposition to Canadian multiculturalism, as a result of Canada's lack of recognition of Quebec as a separate national and cultural identity (Garcea, Kirova, & Wong, 2008, p. 3). Francophone Quebec's self-perception as a vulnerable minority within English North America has heightened

multiculturalism's unpopularity in the province, resulting in the creation of Quebec's interculturalism policy (Kymlicka, 2010, p. 17).

Quebec's history, distinct culture, immigration policies, and French language as a symbol of the culture, constructs a different national discourse from the rest of Canada, creating another version of nationality in Canada. Further, émigrés residing in Quebec are construed as minorities within an existing minority group within the rest of Canada, which creates further identification complexities<sup>xvii</sup>. Thus, it is necessary to investigate Quebec as a minority within Canada, as well as with the status and struggles of minority groups within the minority province, and in relation to the rest of Canadian.

### **Quebec Political and Cultural History**

Canada's socioeconomic and cultural development has been strongly shaped by the colonization projects of Great Britain and France. Lazko (1995) indicates that after the American Revolution (1763-1783), the influx of Anglophone loyalists caused some of New France's political and economic elite to return to France; those who remained in the territory of Canada were soon outnumbered. The British settlers soon took control, which can be considered the origin of Quebec's ethnic and linguistic division (p. 16). Proceeding the British conquering of the Quebec territory from France, which was formalized in 1763, French Canadians sustained their population by relying on natural increases, while Great Britain encouraged mass immigration from the British Isles (Ferguson et al., 2009, p. 69). While the British population grew, the Quebec people remained moderate in size. As a result, the English maintained a position of power (Laczko, 1995, p. 16).

In 1867, the four British North American colonies joined into the Dominion of Canada in an act of confederation<sup>xviii</sup> (Laczko, 1995, p. 17). The province of Quebec (along with

Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia) preceded the creation of the Canadian confederation by over a century, which contributes to the continued importance of provincial governments' strength in Canada, particularly Quebec (Laczko, 1995, p. 17). Francophone Quebec's history as an official 'founding people', yet a national minority in a predominantly Anglophone Canada, validated the need for Quebec to maintain national autonomy. However, it was not until the 1960s that issues of ethnocultural diversity became an important dimension of Canadian government discourse in general (Salée, 2007, p. 107). During the 1960s, "Quebec demanded a restructuring of the Canadian state so that it reflected the duality of the two founding peoples of Canada" so as to satisfy the need to expand Quebec's constitutional powers (Milne, 1991, p. 54).

Quebec's 'Quiet Revolution' in the 1960s was the beginning of a period in which the province began striving to build its own nation within a territorial state based on French Canadian culture and language (Winter, 2011, p. 197). This was necessary as the Prime Minister at the time, Trudeau<sup>xix</sup>, did not support Quebec's cultural and national autonomy, or Canada's recognition as a bicultural state (Ferguson et al., 2009 p. 85). This was visible through his advancement of the multiculturalism policy<sup>xx</sup>. Quebec fought through Constitutional actions to ensure that they were not subsumed as simply another ethnic identity in Canada by the government<sup>xxi</sup>.

Balthazar (1995) indicates that after the passage of the *Official Languages Act* in 1969, giving English and French bilingualism equal status in the government, the policy of multiculturalism picked up momentum in 1971 to satisfy all ethnic groups that felt left out by the bilingualism priority (p. 47). Balthazar (1997) states that in 1982, with the creation of a new national Constitution, Quebec's role as a distinct identity within Canada was still ignored. The National Assembly of Quebec could not ratify a Constitution that recognized

the rights of many ethnic groups, and which diluted their sovereignty (p. 48). The federal government could not go ahead with this Constitution, as a large portion of the population (Quebec) was not in support of it. However, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, who succeeded Trudeau, attempted to create a resolution that could re-build the Canadian Constitution and strengthen support from Quebec.

The next round of Constitutional debates attempted to engage Quebec and resulted in the formation of the Meech Lake Accord of 1987 in which Quebec would be recognized as a distinct society by the federal government (Chambers, 1988, p. 148). This clause however was not adopted; the agreement never took effect and had collapsed by 1989. The failure to substantiate the Meech Lake Accord was again seen as a rejection of Quebec's distinct identity (Chambers, 1988, p. 148). Quebec was left with a Constitution that they would not sign, and a multiculturalism policy that did not reflect or represent their national and cultural ideologies.

It has been argued that Trudeau's advancement of the notion of multiculturalism was to reduce the culture of French-speaking Quebec to one of the many ethnic components of Canada by implying recognition of all ethnic cultures as equal members of Canada, negating the country's dualistic nature (Balthazar, 1995, p. 47). Ferguson et al. (2009) discuss that Quebec's sovereignty developed and grew as a model to counter the "blockages to recognition" that were felt under the fabric of Canadian society. Similarly, Turner (2006) argues that the formation of multiculturalism was Trudeau's attempt to counter the Parti Québécois' agenda for separation and cultural autonomy (p. 611). Indeed, the Québécois felt that under the multiculturalist framework, they were viewed as 'just another ethnic group' within Canada's immigrant population (Winter, 2011, p. 197). The interculturalism policy was introduced by the Quebec government exclusively for Quebec, and established ten years

after the introduction of multiculturalism (Mahrouse, 2010, p. 86).

According to Salée (2007), the 1975 *Quebec Charter*, 1986 Declaration on Ethnic and Race Relations, and the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* stand together as the cornerstone of diversity management in Quebec, which guarantees: “... *fundamental freedoms of religion, of opinion, of expression, of free association and of peaceful assembly to each and every person living in Quebec without distinction, exclusion or preference with respect to race, skin colour, national or ethnic origin, religious affiliation...*” (p. 110).

This statement demonstrates Quebec’s commitment to respecting and upholding equal rights within a diverse population; the declaration appears diligent in declaring freedom and equality of differences. However, would the dominance of the French language medium not influence Quebec’s culture without compromising the Charter?

### **The French Language and Immigration**

Within the rest of Canada, the English language is in no way at risk. English is the majority language in Canada and the dominant language on the continent. Thus, it can be argued that it is unnecessary to safeguard the language in the same way that Quebec feels the need to preserve the French language (Yalden, 2011, p. 10).

Although the French and English languages have coexisted in Canada and Quebec for over two centuries, language legislation was uncommon until the late 1960s. Laczko (1995) states the *Official Languages Act* of 1969 was part of Trudeau’s strategy to combat Quebec state-building nationalists, and that “this policy was in keeping with Trudeau’s aim of strengthening the francophone and Quebec presence in the federal government and *not* granting any special status or powers to the Quebec government”. Nearly ever since it was passed, the Act has been widely criticized in Quebec for not accomplishing enough for the

French language in the province (Laczko, 1995, p. 20).

In 1977, Quebec officially affirmed its French character by adopting Bill 101, defining French as Quebec's official language and policy (Ferguson et al. 2009, pp. 73-74). The province garnered "sporadic powers of autonomy usually reserved for dominant state institutions..." to protect its sovereignty through political actions (Blad & Couton, 2009, p. 656). These decisions went on to impact the lives and culture of the population in Quebec, including Francophones, Anglophones, émigrés residing in the province, as well as incoming immigrants.

It was the sovereign vision of Quebec Premier René Lévesque who, in the 1970's, opposed Prime Minister Trudeau's bilingual vision of two official languages for Canada in federal institutions. Lévesque's vision also included promoting "the use of French as the language of integration of immigrants inside Quebec..." and a model "of association between independent states" (Ferguson et al., 2009, pp. 72-74). Bill 101 was passed following the election of the Parti Québécois in 1976 in opposition to the federal policy, which proclaimed the end of the bilingual policy in Quebec and demoted English from the status of official language. As the integration of new immigrants was previously disproportionately done in the English language, French language schools assumed the task of education and integration (Laczko, 1995, pp. 20-21).

Language as an important marker of identity, specifically in Quebec's case, is a significant driving force behind the province's decisions in immigration processes. 1968 marked the year of the creation of the Quebec Ministry of Immigration, which officially put the issues of immigration and integration of ethnocultural minorities on the province's agenda for the first time (Salée, 2007, p. 107). Quebec was able to achieve sovereignty from English Canada by positioning immigration practices to suit Quebec's priority as a francophone

society. After 1991, Canada granted full “administrative autonomy” to Quebec’s government with regards to immigration (Blad & Couton, 2009, p. 656).

According to Conrick and Donovan (2010), whereas the majority of migrants to Canada previously may have come from Europe, the immigrant population significantly diversified in recent decades. Investigating Quebec’s migrant demographic indicates the top source countries of immigrants differ from the rest of Canada, and are predominantly from francophone regions around the world (p. 333). However, this did not create a population of citizens who would more easily embrace Quebec culture in years to come, as we will see in following sections<sup>xxii</sup>.

Blad and Couton (2009) indicate that Quebec’s immigration system has “successfully captured immigration control from the federal government, hence reinforcing its own sovereignty”<sup>xxiii</sup>. Quebec’s immigration system no longer challenges traditional nation-statehood but is reinforcing it (pp. 646-647). The province changed the types of immigrants it receives and how it relates to them, thus reinforcing its own national identity and structuring the province around a single national cultural norm: the French language (Blad & Couton, 2009, p.652). Language learning and integration are two issues that are closely linked; newcomers or immigrants to Canada might not be considered, or consider themselves, as fully and successfully integrated unless they are able to communicate in one of the official languages, specifically French in Quebec’s case (Conrick and Donovan, 2010, p. 332). Quebec would therefore consider French language development for émigrés as integral to belonging in Quebec.

The degree to which the Quebec government projected the necessary components to comply with cultural practices is also seen through the White Paper titled *Autant de façons d’être Québécois* (1981). It is an action plan for cultural communities that outline conditions

of the interculturalism policy and the canons of how to integrate into the province's population. Blad & Couton (2009) identify Quebec's measures as "a collection of legislation and policies that simultaneously strengthens the dominant position of the French language while facilitating the accommodation and integration of immigrants..." (p. 659). Quebec's cultural formation is backed by provincial action that provides a formula to assist immigrant identity acculturation.

Banting and Soroka (2012) describe ethnic identity anxieties, stating, "the realities of immigrant integration on the ground are deeply conditioned by the historic forms of ethnic diversity within each country" (pp. 156-157). For example, in some countries the process of integration is defined by a relatively homogenous host culture with diverse newcomers (p. 158). However, in the case of Canada the host population is historically fragmented, which divides newcomers' expectations of how to join the host country (p. 158). This has led to further complexity as newcomers attempt to make sense of the cultural expectations of Francophone Quebec in an English-dominated state (p. 158), which can influence feelings of belonging in the province vis-à-vis the country.

With Quebec's cultural struggles within Canada, émigrés are faced with an even more complex process of identification. To what extent can the end-all for immigrant integration rest solely on language acquisition without considering other identity politics?

### **Civic Citizenship and Ethnic Accommodation**

The battle for French Canadians to gain recognition institutionally and culturally as an equal partner with English Canada has been ongoing since before the Confederation of Canada (Ferguson et.al, 2009, p. 72). Quebec's cultural identity has been self-perceived as a minority culture, and resulted in the sense that they were under siege and thus "could not

afford to be too tolerant, lest they be swallowed up by Anglophones and immigrants” (Mahrouse, 2010, p. 91). Hence the priority grew to limit émigrés cultural practices to protect the French language culture<sup>xxiv</sup>.

By the late 1990’s, Quebec began to frame its notions of citizenship around diversity and integration, while historical characteristics of citizenship may have been denoted to race and ethnicities (Salée, 2007, p. 109). People from different ethnicities and races were welcomed to take part in Canadian citizenship in Quebec. What became more important was not the ancestry of an individual but the capacity to adopt the ideals and language; this became the goal of Canadian citizenship in Quebec. This form of ‘civic’ citizenship was based on the premise that émigrés would adopt Quebec’s vision of culture, with limited flexibility of maintaining their own cultural rituals due to French fears of compromising their identity.

The emergence of the reasonable accommodation debate questioned the extent to which ethnic cultural practices should be accepted or allowed within Quebec cultural discourses. The concept of reasonable accommodation surfaced and has been active in Quebec in recent years, which Mahrouse (2010) describes as a “heated debate on the extent to which the practices of minority and immigrant groups should be accommodated” (p. 85). According to Mahrouse (2010), the context for the reasonable accommodations debate, which was launched in the media in 2006, has been surrounded by Quebec’s interculturalism policy. There were questions of how far Quebec should go to allow for diverse cultural experiences of émigrés under the interculturalism framework (pp. 85-86).

Indeed, the reasonable accommodation debate was linked to interculturalism. Although the acquisition of French as the primary institutionalized language was firm, there were fears of how tolerant the Québécois should be about the cultural norms of émigrés. For

example, how and what émigrés practiced so as to not threaten the Quebec identity, and to absorb émigrés cultural norms into the larger culture. The debate “touched a number of emotional chords among French-Canadian Quebecers” who felt émigrés threatened national history and secularism to its identity (Mahrouse, 2010, p. 87).

In 2007, Gerard Bouchard and Charles Taylor were appointed by the Premier of Quebec to co-chair the Quebec Commission on Reasonable Accommodation. The *Building the Future, a Time for Reconciliation: Abridged Report* (2008) was produced to document the Bouchard-Taylor Commission’s findings. According to the report, the Commission was “inspired by a search for balance and fairness, in a spirit of compromise” (p. 5). The Commission was established to respond to public discontent concerning the accommodation debate and to remedy challenges in Quebec’s cultural discourses within the province. Part of the Commission’s mandate was to review interculturalism and the themes of the province’s cultural objectives within ‘Quebec identity’ (Bouchard & Taylor, 2008, pp. 7 & 8). “Integration in a spirit of equality and reciprocity” was guiding the analysis, which according to Bouchard and Taylor diffuses the debate on accommodation (p. 12). The Bouchard-Taylor (2008) report outlines a clear objective: “integration through pluralism, equality and reciprocity...” This translates to Francophone Quebec identity promotion without creating exclusions or divisions (p. 94).

Bouchard and Taylor’s (2008) research and consultations concluded that “the foundations of collective life in Quebec are not in a critical situation” and the tenseness surrounding the debate is a crisis of perceptions (p. 13). The public in Quebec generally perceived their identity to be more vulnerable than it was in reality. Negative judgments on accommodation practices, including the feeling that social order was being threatened by the flexibility and negotiation of accommodating cultural diversity, was in fact not endangering

Quebec's identity (p. 13). Thus, the interculturalism policy was successful in maintaining the Francophone identity according to the Commission.

According to the debate on reasonable accommodation, the interculturalism model of civic citizenship is within the confines of ensuring that cultures are not so diverse that they impede on Quebec cultural practices. Thus, Quebec's civic citizenship for émigrés extends so far, so as to not infringe on Quebec cultural priorities. However, can different forms of nationality or citizenship be reflected by the nation-state? Will Quebec's civic citizenship be represented in the Census of Canada? Quebec's self-proclamation of a national identity likely raises issues of inconsistencies between Quebec's perceptions of nationality against Canada's representation of Quebec, notwithstanding their two different diversity policies.

Although multiculturalism and interculturalism are often compared and contrasted, Taylor (2012) states that both policies are in fact quite similar, although the narrative surrounding them must be different in order for federal and provincial populations to accept either of them (p. 413). Yalden (2011) also argues that multiculturalism and interculturalism are essentially the same and have similar underlying context, such as the principle of multiple identities recognized along with the right to maintain an affiliation with one's ethnic group. The major distinction is the emphasis on "the French-speaking core" and the vigorous need to maintain that core, which is a perceived threat when accommodating minority communities (p. 10).

### **Narratives and Power**

The construction of narratives plays an incremental role in the formation of cultural and national identity. Austin (2010) classifies cultural relations as stemming from a series of narratives that take place, which determines the current exercise of power and governs

feelings of belonging (p.19). These narratives become essential to the formation of Canada's nationhood and can be stronger than the policies themselves. Thus the discourses surrounding multiculturalism and interculturalism, and the way they construct identities (whether cultural, national, ethnic, etc.), play a role in relation to equality.

The Quebec state and students of Quebec diversity issues have distinguished "the federal and the Quebec approaches as dissimilar and even incompatible" (Salée, 2007, p. 113). However, Taylor's (2012) essay argues that the difference between them is not a matter of the concrete policies, but rather concerns the story that is being told (p. 416). The difference in terminology or the semantic distinction is necessary for the narrative surrounding both concepts, as Quebec's ideologies, national discourses, and cultural identity could not fit into the Canadian multiculturalism narrative based on their demography and ancestry from Francophone settlers, language, and culture (Taylor, 2012, pp. 416-417). Thus the narratives of multiculturalism and interculturalism significantly represent more than the policies themselves; the stories they tell are more relevant than the pragmatics surrounding their implementation as policies. The question would thus be whether the policies impact differently how citizens are living day-to-day.

Indeed, historically, Canada's master-narrative consists of two founding nations: France and Britain. Quebec's interpretation of Canadian history considers their cultural narratives as separate and unequal, while the federal government believes them to be independent founders that share common ground, while coexisting together. Austin (2010) draws that both Canada and Quebec's contemporary narratives provide a high-yielding domain "for the modern exclusion of non-White groups, despite the fact that this population is inching towards half the population living in Canada's major cities" (p. 25). Either version of the narrative results in the marginalization of ethnic minorities regardless of the objectives

Canada and Quebec's policies are undertaking as diversity management tools.

The Gerard-Taylor Commission asserted that Quebec's cultural identity is *not* being threatened by émigrés. Although Quebec feels a sense of vulnerability from the rest of Canada, their identity discourses for Francophone Quebec cultural maintenance seems intact. However, the circumstances surrounding the cultural position of émigrés historically and currently have not been agreeable, from both multiculturalism and interculturalism perspectives. Although multiculturalism and interculturalism narratives have been constructed differently, they remain similar; both frameworks for diversity management use rhetoric to proclaim equality amongst cultural groups, but fall short of delivering such conditions.

### **Émigrés' Intercultural Experiences**

A state or nation can institutionally influence and disseminate a representation of cultural characteristics to which the population should ascribe. The Quebec Ministry of Immigration and Cultural Communities cultivated the creation of official government documents and discourses in the political domain to reinforce common Quebec identity, such as the 1980 White Paper: *Autant de façon d'être Québécois*, or the reasonable accommodation debate, which in turn reinforces the interculturalism policy. Projects such as these contribute to the expectations and norms of dominant society, which resulted in the current government's attempt to police cultural values.

National cultural discourses and policies impact population groups in various ways, such as influencing the process of self-identification. Moreover, discourses and policies can limit and lack heterogeneous identity representations. Some scholars remain optimistic about interculturalism's position within Quebec, such as Blad & Couton (2009), who describe it as

“an active political strategy designed to combine relative openness to globalising social forces, particularly international migration, with a commitment to the maintenance of a coherent national community” (p. 645). Maintaining a nation-building discourse is a clear objective; however, there are few explanations of how multinational and cultural experiences are embraced other than through declarations of accommodation and tolerance as a solution to view diverse cultures in a positive light.

Scholars supporting interculturalism deem Quebec’s approach to diversity management as “a nuanced, fairer and more suitable vision of diversity management than that of the Canadian state” (Salée, 2007, p. 115). Garcea et al. (2008) argue that the interculturalism policy places the responsibility on the state to harmonize measures for diversity to participate in all segments of society and governance (p. 5). Interculturalism discourses are less ambiguous as they clearly state the requirement and expectation to acquire the French language, which the province supports by designing immigration processes that target Francophone regions. Interculturalism in this case sets the Francophone majority as noble and integrative, in which minorities are expected to converge into a common civic citizenship that brings together all Québécois, regardless of their ethnic origins.

Salée (2007) asserts that there are many individuals in Quebec growing dissatisfied and feeling disadvantaged by a socioeconomic situation that seems to stem from their position as a minority in the province. Members of minority groups feel “disenchanted with the state’s inability to fulfill its promise of social justice, equality, fairness and self-determination” and as a result, question whether they truly belong to the Quebec society. This can typically be explained as an “appreciable disparity” between the expected results of the state’s diversity policies, versus the effective outcome, in this case particularly for socioeconomic justice (p. 106). A sense of belonging does not stem from legislation and rhetoric of an inclusive

society, but goes beyond policies and legal status.

Literary works and the arts often represent cultural conditions and characteristics of their time period, and can reflect the sentiments of a population group. Ireland and Proulx (2009) describe the emergence of works that reflect the increasingly plural nature of the Québécois society when describing what is commonly known as ‘l’écriture migrante’, which shatters the idea of a homogenous national identity (p. 36)<sup>xxv</sup>. The emergence of these immigrant writers of later generations “particularly of the non-European and ‘visible’ variety, are claiming their cultural specificity and producing a new genre of literature known as l’écriture migrante”; up until the 1960s, most immigrants from Western European origin tended to assimilate to their new identities (Randall, 2008, p. 28). The mere existence of these writings and what they represented for émigrés demonstrated identity struggles of difference within their host nation. The works often contain themes of belonging, exile, and the expression of cultural identity as a psychological journey that depicts immigrants and their challenges within the Canadian-Québécois culture (Ireland & Proulx, 2009, pp. 36-37, 38).

Ireland & Proulx (2009) outline the work of Bianca Zagolin, whose characterization of Québécois literature equates successful integration with qualities of assimilation and depicts deep, dark, collective images of Canada (p. 41). These literary works flourished as émigrés migrated and identity struggles grew<sup>xxvi</sup>. The migrant writings demonstrate feelings of anxiety, the existence of minority groups, and a need for an outlet of expression for different cultures separate from mainstream channels. The identity behind these writings is a disenfranchised population struggling to belong in their host country.

Differences of ethnicity and culture in Canada appear to be hindering the formula for an inclusive society with equal rights and privileges. Austin (2010) described

interculturalism as Quebec's response to the increase of immigrants, "...as a way in which entitlements to citizenship are racially inscribed and proscribed, without guaranteed 'participation in the performative imageries and the poetics and aesthetics of national identification'" which provokes "a 'cultural politics' of inclusion and exclusion that, in the final analysis, is racialized" (p. 23). Salée (2007) adds that the gap between the theory and the delivery lies not in the principles, but in the ability to deliver on them with economic and political balances between Euro-descendants and ethnocultural minority groups (p. 106).

Conversely, Blad and Couton (2009) assert that under intercultural nationalism, migrants are encouraged to retain beliefs and values, "however, the pre-existing dominant public milieu is institutionally protected" (p. 652). Mahrouse (2010) argues that the emphasis on interculturalism is "on the subordination of respect for diversity 'to the need to perpetuate the French-language culture'", meaning that Quebec's interculturalism policy of convergence requires immigrant and minority groups to assimilate to a certain degree to ensure that identity and culture are preserved (p.86).

The choice is either to risk losing Francophone identity rights, or to control the development of cultural differences. Mahrouse (2010) describes that minority and immigrant assimilation was necessary for the nationality of Quebec, rather than multiculturalism, regardless of exclusions that took place within the policy. She states that "the debate was thus strongly polarized, so that one could only be sympathetic to the preservation of francophone rights and culture or else is complicit in their repression" (p. 91). Further, the way in which institutions are structured forces ethnic minorities to adapt their language skills to English or French in order to obtain full access, opportunities, and privileges of public life. Thus, the choice would be to assimilate in order to integrate, or to refuse to adapt to dominant cultural identity, which hinders the ability of being a successful member of Quebec

society; both subjugate ethnic groups. Whether complying with the dominant culture or not, a negotiation takes place between cultural identities to which émigrés cultures would always be repressed. Thus, the debate on reasonable accommodation is paradoxical if we take into account the Bouchard-Taylor Commission, which reported that Quebec's identity is not facing any critical threat. The reasonable accommodation debate is arguably not based on Quebec's cultural repression within Canada, but possibly the power relations between émigrés/minorities, and the terms of their relations towards the rest of Quebec.

Salée (2007) states that Quebec is still confronted with a growing socioeconomic divide between minorities and the Euro-descendant majority. He contends that much of this is related to integration and social cohesion within Quebec, and not necessarily to education, or capacity to work in both English and French. Salée (2007) affirms that many minorities have the capacity to function comfortably in either language, but remain subordinate (pp. 119-120).

The socioeconomic gap that separates racialized minorities and the Euro-descendant majority in Quebec confirms inequality of social and economic power. Immigration is not the explanation; it is not only newcomers who are experiencing an imbalance, but also émigrés who have been in the province for 15 years or more, or have been born in and are integral to Quebec's social fabric (Salée, 2007, p. 120). To what degree then do émigrés have to be "Québécois" to be accepted as an equal member of society? Will émigrés ever be an "authentic" or constitutive part of Quebec's social fabric? Ipso facto, language integration is not the determining factor of social cohesion and belonging, and is not the core of economic integration. Thus, nor is integration the solution for cohesion and a sense of belonging in Quebec, as per the interculturalism policy.

According to Salée, the "wholehearted insertion into dominant culture and politics may

also depend on a number of other factors...” including the ease of acculturation, linguistic assimilation for immigrants and their children, and demonstrated acceptance by the majority of identity differences, or the willingness of minorities to endorse the majority culture (pp. 120-121). However, Salée (2007) insists that simply claiming that the racialization of social relations has a bearing on the socioeconomic outcomes of population groups, and understanding Quebec’s approach to diversity management as “inherently racist or neoracist”, will not assist in understanding why these disparities persist. We must first acknowledge that the modern state is founded on social exclusions “before we can gauge the pervasiveness of those relations” (p. 125). The Eurocentric way of thought is present in Quebec’s mode of thought and in understanding social hierarchies (Salée, 2007, p. 127). Deconstructing these discourses is required to create a functioning diversity model that reflects rights and equality without creating peripheral groups.

### **Canadian Multicultural Diversity Policies Compared**

The comparison of multiculturalism and interculturalism affords a multiplicity of interpretations. Blad and Couton (2009) contend that the distinction between the two policies is the specific traditional linguistic and (ethno) cultural norms in Quebec, which serve as a social context to which migrants must integrate, while multiculturalism “requires fewer official sociocultural requisites” (p. 651). Interculturalism research has displayed that Quebec favours linguistic over ethnic selection for immigrants; the racial and ethnic origin of individuals becomes irrelevant in their version of civic citizenship as the French language priority triumphs as the requisite for immigrant selection.

Although Quebec’s language integration policy appears less open to other languages, the emphasis on the need to learn French in order to become an active member of Quebec

society, according to Conrick & Donovan (2010), is less ambiguous as the province's commitment to the French language is clear (p. 341). French language acquisition promoted as essential to Quebec provides more clarity of the requirements of interculturalism among immigrants<sup>xxvii</sup>. However, aspects of discrimination are present based on implementing French as a preference of who is accepted to immigrate, and exploitation of why this type of migrant is preferred; the immigration process functions primarily in the interest of the provincial culture. Is this not considered prejudiced against non-Francophone immigrants in and of itself?

Although Taylor (2012) identifies multiculturalism and interculturalism as relatively similar policies, he sees a distinction between the two concepts with the 'multi' narrative as one that discounts traditional ethno-historical identity without putting another in its place - meaning the coexistence of cultural identities in society but no identity being made official. He claims the 'inter' narrative stems from "the reigning historical identity, but sees it evolving in a process in which all citizens, of whatever identity, have a voice, and no-one's input has a privileged status" (p. 418). This claim equates the language of French as that voice without privileging, whereas multiculturalism proclaims no official culture but a Canadian nationality. However, both policies appear idealistic; Taylor's (2012) vision does not acknowledge the position of Euro-descendants who, as argued by the research, do experience the better side of an imbalance of privileges within interculturalism compared to émigrés. Moreover, both policies boast diversity management, accommodation, and universal human rights, but do not state *how* this is to be achieved for émigrés who enter a majority socioeconomic culture, other than by encouraging forced "integration".

The central question that Garcea (2008) identifies is not whether Canada should or should not operate in accordance with either framework, but rather a configuration or version

of the two, as they both lack precise conceptualization and share more in common than is often acknowledged (p. 157). Garcea (2008) emphasizes that policymakers must ensure that the integrity of Canada's management of diversity not be compromised, whether it be a modified or refined version of current multicultural and intercultural frameworks, a hybridized version of the two, or the formation of a completely new paradigm; the efficacy and morality of diversity management should be at the core (p. 156). However, these policies need to be accompanied by a deconstruction of current ideologies that are creating identities based on the racial and ethnic culture of not only new migrants, but of all émigrés in both Quebec and Canada. Furthermore, what appears to be missing in both multiculturalism and interculturalism policies is a comprehensive account of what is involved in "diversity management" and whether there is an awareness of what is involved in achieving equality, including for émigrés with cultural experiences separate and different from the Canadian majority. Can cultural equality and reciprocity exist in an environment of integration and assimilation?

Similar to multiculturalism, the Québécois support interculturalism as an integration model despite the absence of an official text that details or defines it as a model for managing intercultural relations (Bouchard and Taylor, 2008, p. 34). Bouchard and Taylor (2008) recommend a policy or declaration that broadly defines interculturalism to serve as a key component of the social blueprint or reference (pp. 42-43). Both multicultural policies in Canada are filled with rhetoric and lack clear goals and an action-plan. Further, can formal legislation address the challenges of mainstream discourses on fluid identity and belonging? Benessaïeh (2010) indicates that both intercultural and multicultural models are based on the premise of cultural boundedness, difference, or propensity to conflict, which descends from

the essentialist views of culture (p. 19). Thus, the dynamic nature of culture is neither considered under the Canadian multiculturalism framework, nor Quebec's interculturalism.

### **Chapter 2 Summary**

Through the struggle for duality and national autonomy, Quebec showcases unique identity discourses by its own provincial proclamation, and not willingly by the federal government. The chapter has demonstrated that interculturalism is clearer in its expectations of cultural integration, contrary to the multiculturalism policy, which has been expressed with more ambiguity. However, there is no resolution in either case of how ethnic and cultural development and preservation is to take place, or of how multiple cultural experiences are to be accounted for while maintaining equality and rights for all cultural groups. Moreover, the policy goals of integration do not seem to be a smooth process, with gaps between the theoretical implementation and expected outcome of integration, equality and reciprocity, versus the real outcomes of assimilation, exclusion, and marginalization. Are there limits to culture development and belonging in Canada for those positioned outside the status quo? Neither linguistic nor economic integration in Quebec are enough to create a sense of belonging for émigrés, even those born in Quebec or who have been there long term, or to create conditions of equality and acceptance among the population.

Neither multiculturalism nor interculturalism appeals to the needs of minority populations; both policies set out to achieve social cohesion under the constraints of the majority culture. Although they are generally perceived as different, the narratives constructed around interculturalism and multiculturalism weigh heavier than what each policy entails. To what extent then can multiculturalism and interculturalism be considered Janus-Faced policies in the reality of their application? Both policies are considered tools for

diversity management - they stem from the same issue and arguably deliver the same outcome. However, they have two different narratives or ‘faces’ for the same issue<sup>xxviii</sup>. If multiculturalism and interculturalism can be viewed as similar, would this infer that citizenship experiences are the same for émigrés living anywhere in Canada? How do both policies differ in everyday life for émigrés’ identity experience?

Yalden (2011) suggests that multiculturalism and interculturalism are similar as they proclaim similar messages such as: “the principle of multiple identities is recognized, as is the right to maintain an affiliation with one’s ethnic group.” Or, “for those citizens who so wish, it is desirable for initial affiliations to survive...” (p. 11). Much of this is catalyzed through racializing identity, granting inclusions while alienating minority culture, regardless of claims of reciprocity, equality, and civic citizenship. As we have discovered through its creation, the intercultural policy emerged not only to combat anxieties of a weakened Quebec minority identity within the majority Anglophone Canada, but also to manage cultural diversities within the province so as not to threaten Quebec’s French cultural priority.

If the multiculturalism policy is concerned with managing ethnicities for a national culture and eliminating cultural duality, and interculturalism is concerned with the battle to maintain autonomy over the dominant North American English rule, then to what extent are ethnicities a threat to Quebec French culture? Would it then not be Anglophone Canada presenting a threat to Quebec identity, and not émigrés? Ipso facto, ethnicities would appear as pawns to strengthen Quebec’s French core to combat English authority - integrating/assimilating ethnicities to a “civic citizenship” to create a stronger Quebec. To what extent then was the reasonable accommodation debate misguided in claiming

accommodating ethnicities was the source of the threat to Quebec identity and not overtly Anglophone Canada?

The questions that remain: how would a policy aim to satisfy the identity needs of Quebec within Canada, while respecting the government of Canada's social, cultural, political, and economic objectives, and achieve equality and rights for émigrés? What measures will Canadian institutions undergo to reform dated conceptualizations of static, essentialized, national and cultural characteristics, and allow for a more inclusive, non-exclusionary version of Canadian citizenship?

A solution for a refined, modern version of citizenship may involve a possible paradigm shift to account for a deeper, multidimensional meaning of cultural, national, and ethnic identity. This transcends traditional notions to encompass transcultural and transnational experiences. Furthermore, general discourses require repositioning from recognition of differences to recognition of similarities, the process of identification as ongoing, and the consideration of people as dynamic individuals rather than distinctly tied to ethnic, cultural, national, or historic experiences. Can a sense of belonging be achieved through multiculturalism and interculturalism frameworks without severely negotiating cultural identity to accommodate to dominant discourses? A proclamation of equality and encouragement for cultural preservation in legislation is limited as a solution. The latter are options to challenge the "pure" and "authentic" identities for citizenship, and pose problems for the limits of static culture. The following chapter's analysis will uncover how the Census of Canada creates conditions of Canadian citizenship by analyzing the questionnaires. The analysis displays the way in which Canada conceptualizes important markers of identity.

### **Chapter 3 – Citizenship Analysis through the Census of Canada**

This thesis does not aim to answer all of the concerns and questions outlined, but instead the research aims to provide clarity on the conditions of cultural discourses in Canada, while deconstructing Canadian normative cultural discourses to identify possible impediments. Through the investigation of the literature on multiculturalism and interculturalism, we are able to consider obstacles in the conceptualization of Canadian cultural identity, which will then be compared through the analysis of state citizenship. This investigation allows us to suggest possible ways to address or improve some of the limitations found in diversity management frameworks and identity conceptualizations in Canada's social fabric.

Canada's inclusive citizenship, predicated on Canadian multiculturalism, is proclaimed as a manifestation of equal opportunities and rights, regardless of identity differences, including cultural heritage, ethnicity, and ancestry. It is presupposed in Canadian laws and policy. Every Canadian citizen is entitled to receive, possess, and belong to this system of citizenship<sup>xxix</sup>.

According to Bloemraad et al. (2008), citizenship itself is considered a contract - a relationship between individuals and the state, where both have rights and obligations. To maintain this contract, the state guarantees basic rights to the individual, while individuals abide by state-enforced obligations such as paying taxes, completing compulsory education and obeying laws. All members of the state are given the rights and promise of full equality before the law, as presented in Canadian law and policy. A major confrontation that is left unresolved, however, is how to transform these formal principles into "substantive equality" in common discourses (p. 156).

An additional challenge is the continuing and unresolved tension between competing Canadian discourses of nationality which proclaim two different versions of citizenship: Quebec's civic citizenship based on the interculturalism policy, and Canada's inclusive citizenship invested in the multiculturalism policy. Both frameworks aim to function within a population of émigrés.

The Census of Canada collects data to structure and develop programs, services, and policies, based on Canada's population<sup>xxx</sup>. Indeed, the Census offers a framework through which one can qualify Canadian identity. Census questionnaires are used to understand how the Canadian government represents and conceptualizes the identity of the population, reflective of Canadian discourses. However, the questionnaires can also have an impact on the process of self-identification for individuals in Canada. The Census questions enumerate characteristics, expectations, and boundaries to which we will discover that latent meaning is created and disseminated to the population. How is meaning formed and constructed in Canadian society through the Census of Canada?

Five markers were used to conceptualize Canadian citizenship, which revealed on-going themes that were then used to conceptualize the markers as the units of analysis. The 1971, 1991 and 2006 charts of the questions categorized by markers can be found in Appendix A. The following is a three-part analysis that first introduces the way in which Canadian identity is created by reinforcing the markers of citizenship, followed by questioning the conceptualization of what each marker represents. The third part of the analysis consists of three sections where markers are cross-referenced with each other, with the literature, and with the markers and literature against personal experience. The purpose of this analysis is to demonstrate the limitations in the current Canadian citizenship paradigm

and the politics involved in what and how questions are posed, which is then compared to literature on Canadian cultural diversity measures.

### **The Markers of Citizenship**

The five markers of citizenship found in the Census emerged from common themes found in the questions and related to pertinent identity markers of subjects, under which questions were categorized. The following is a breakdown of the meaning of each marker from 1971, 1991, and 2006: (1) culture; (2) economic; (3) education; (4) origin (national and immigrant); and (5) social markers of citizenship.

The *cultural* marker refers to a set of shared behaviour, beliefs, and values conveyed by members of groups within the population - the way in which people make sense of their surroundings. Canada as a nation-state contains multiple cultural identities and can pertain to many cultures as nationhood is imagined and can vary for different groups in society. A cultural identity is often a collective and personal identity to which members attribute themselves. Culture as a Canadian citizenship marker displays the cultural diversity and multicultural values that Canadian identity embodies. Appendix B presents a conceptualization of the cultural marker.

The *economic* circumstances of an individual can be a reflection of their position and engagement in a nation-state. Economic markers of citizenship refer to employment, production, distribution, and use of income and resources. These markers involve the creation of wealth. Economic characteristics are an important aspect of citizenship as they consider a subject's contribution to the overall wealth and activity of an economy within the nation-state. Appendix C presents a conceptualization of the economic marker.

*Education* as a marker gathers information on the level and type of education that the population receives; it refers to the process of receiving or obtaining formal knowledge from accredited institutions. There are different levels and types of education that one can receive within this structured system of learning. An individual's level of education is relevant as it can be a measure or a means of building social capital and improving individual and national economic success, and of being recognized within the population. Appendix D presents a conceptualization of the education marker.

The marker that discusses the *origin* of citizens was divided into two categories: national origins (in the province), and immigrant origins (outside of Canada), which discuss where Canadians originate. The way in which the Census questions were categorized (between national and immigrant variables) was by whether the questions themselves, or the options provided to respond, reflected the response of someone who was considered a "national citizen" (one who did not overtly immigrate recently enough to display visible signs of other cultures), and an "immigrant citizen" (as a subject or their ancestors who displayed more clear lineage or ties to another country, culture, ethnicity, or citizenship). The origin marker is important as it depicts the geographical, cultural and citizenship background of individuals, their families, and their movement within Canada, as well as immigration to Canada. Appendix E presents a conceptualization of the origin marker.

The *social* marker represents the behaviour of how society is and should be structured in relation to the people within it - the ordinary life and affairs of citizens and the social relationships among the population. It is important to understand these social characteristics in order to be able to measure, predict, plan, and organize the social affairs of the nation-state, and to see how citizens interact with each other. Appendix F presents a conceptualization of the social marker.

### **Questioning the Units of Analysis**

Understanding the meaning and operationalization of the five markers of citizenships is the starting point of the analysis, which then moves towards content analysis by questioning each marker and breaking down its meaning within the content of the Census. The content analysis begins by examining the structures of the questions along with potential meanings that could be implicated with how and what is communicated. The analysis continues by applying the discourse analysis (the literature) to relate the content to the context of society and discuss the relationship between subjects and social structures. This facilitates the comprehension of relations between discourse, power and dominance, and the potential of producing social inequalities.

Common questions and themes reappeared within the markers in the Census questionnaire as units of observation. The next section discusses the content and validity of each theme while taking into account a heterogeneous population and identification as a fluid process. The analysis takes place by examining the questions, the options and guidelines for the possibility of responses, as well as how they can be applied to a population with different backgrounds and needs.

**Culture.** Shared language and religion portrays cultural traits, and the ethnic and cultural group of ancestors reflect a shared understanding of cultural histories, habits, and traditions. They should compose a general overview of what can be considered an individual's cultural experience.

Language is a crucial element of culture as it is the means by which culture is communicated, and can also be an indication of culture. Within this marker, language can be divided into five groups: (1) language first spoken and still understood; (2) language that is most often

spoken at home; (3) conversational ability in English or French; (4) conversational ability in a language other than English or French; (5) and other languages being spoken at home on a regular basis. Together, these questions depict what languages are used in Canadian society as well as focus on the use of language in personal lives.

**Group 1.** This question asks what language the subject first encountered and still understands. In what circumstances would a language be spoken at a young age and not presently understood? Language development can begin at one point, and through cultural and language exposure, change based on one's environment. For a mother tongue to no longer be understood would allow one to believe that there are factors influencing language use in society. This is presented with the dilemma of competing languages within a nation-state, whether between English and French, or other languages. The question can also be interpreted as what language did the subject speak before entering society, as the mother tongue is typically learned at home and inherited from parents' cultural heritage (or background). It is not until the subject enters society that the subject's language of origin would experience external pressure to adapt to the dominant language of the environment, whether through school, friends, or other social interactions. This case can typically be applied to émigrés as well. Over time, an individual's mother tongue or their children's language skills can be influenced as they are faced with the necessity of acquiring a dominant or "official language" in order to integrate. The question of a subject's mother tongue implies an environment of multiple languages outside the normative dominant language. Could this negotiation impede the preservation of other languages?

Each Census included options for responding to the question: English, French, or other. The failure to choose one or both of the official languages can entail a nature of foreignness separate to the dominant culture, and furthermore, can compromise a sense of

belonging. This question sets apart languages other than English or French as outside normative frameworks.

**Group 2.** Asking which language is most often spoken at home places relevance on the family or personal life of a subject. As home life is less subject to influences of language acquisition, it typically nurtures cultural practices of the family and is separate from public life. In 1971, the question in the Census regarding mother tongue gave the option to choose from English, French, German, Italian, or Other (specify) as a response. However, the question regarding what language is most often spoken at home in 1971 provided the option of choosing English, French, German, Indian, Italian, Magyar, Netherlands, Polish, Ukrainian, or Other. Presenting nine options for the latter question demonstrates that a foreign language is less likely to be a mother tongue but is more likely to be acceptable or likely to be spoken in the home. In addition, these languages (other than native Indian) stem from European regions and present a Eurocentric form of representation. Does this favour a group of the population, or simply reflect the demographic of immigrants in Canada at that time? When the 2006 Census asked the same question, the options for answering were English, French, or Other: implying it is most common for Canadian citizens to speak one of those two languages, and that there are too many languages as possibilities to provide examples.

**Group 3.** As English and French are the languages needed to communicate in Canadian society, questions of whether or not an individual can understand either language well enough to conduct a conversation is crucial for successful participation in society. This question is also included within the social marker of citizenship. Speaking one or both of these languages can also speak to which of the dual Canadian cultures an individual can identify with; they represent the bilingual structure of Canada and Quebec. Would choosing

one language over the other create a deeper wedge or distinction between the English and French cultural narratives in Canada? Would not being able to conduct a conversation in either language result in a feeling of alienation, exclusion and marginalization? The structure of this question does set out language distinctions that can produce identity differences; however, it emphasises the importance of the official languages because of the need to integrate into society through conversational ability.

**Group 4.** The 1991 and 2006 Censuses ask the population what language other than English or French the subject can use to have a conversation. It is likely that this question applies to émigrés more than a “national citizen” population, as émigrés carry with them language skills of their ancestors’ ethnicity or culture. The immigrant population is thus easily classified as such based on their knowledge of a different language. The question serves to uncover what languages are being used in Canada other than English or French; specifying otherwise positions individuals outside of the dominant frameworks.

**Group 5.** The question of what other languages are being spoken at home on a regular basis was posed only in the 2006 Census, taking into consideration the multiplicity of languages that can be spoken outside the public sphere and inside the home, and that may be in addition to an individual’s mother tongue. It is interesting to note that there is more emphasis on speaking foreign languages at home, and less in a public place, including social or work environments, and professional settings. Language questions within the Census have created two streams of identity in a subject’s life, one where it is more acceptable to speak a foreign language within one’s home life, and the other less likely outside in the public context. Throughout the questionnaire, languages other than English and French are placed in opposition to the public dominant language backdrop of all other languages in Canada.

**Religion.** Another unit of analysis in the cultural marker of citizenship includes questions of the subject's religion. These questions aim to place individuals within a certain category of faith. The 1971 and 1991 questionnaires gave the opportunity to respond to one faith. To what extent does this limit the subject from identifying practicing more than one faith? For example, if parents are of different faiths the subject would have to choose one. Further, religion as an indicator of identity takes something immeasurable or indefinite, such as faith, and categorizes it into something that is simplified as an answer of "what is your religion," thus limiting identity conceptualizations and using religion as an identifier. There are exclusionary aspects of choosing one religion over the other, particularly if choosing one that is typically practiced by a minority population, and underrepresented in Canadian society.

Lastly, the question of one's ethnic or cultural group, or of one's ancestry, was posed in each Census, and asks the origins of an individual and to which group they belong. The 1971 survey asked the question exclusively for the male side of the family and gave the option to choose only one. While the 2006 survey asked one question regarding the subject's ancestral background, and one regarding the subject's background, the 1991 Census only inquired about the ancestral background. Over the three Censuses, the cultural and ethnic options given to choose from varied. The 1991 and 2006 Censuses indicated the subject should mark or specify as many options as applicable. The question itself conflates ethnicity and culture, but asks that the background of the individual represent their cultural experiences. Although the 1971 Census gave the opportunity to respond to one category, the 1991 and 2006 questionnaires did acknowledge the possibility that the subject considered more than one ethnic or cultural group as their background. However, does this question essentialize the categories of ethnicity and culture and create disparities for émigrés in

relation to the state? Even as a Canadian citizen, there are still questions of the ethnic or cultural background of not only subjects, but of their ancestors as well.

**Economic.** Within the economic marker of citizenship, data was gathered to account for income, ownership, and an individual's activity in the labour market. To what extent does everyone have equal access to economic opportunities in Canada?

The ownership or rental of a home is common for members of the population and is almost unavoidable; however, this can seem like a privilege to some. How does this reflect the experience of subjects and their families who share a home that is not their own - i.e. families living with other families, or individuals who do not have a place to reside and are considered homeless? The expectation of residing in a household can appear normative, as shelter is a basic necessity; however, the conditions surrounding it are constructed, such as having to contribute to the Canadian labour market in order to have shelter. Do subjects who do not fall within the traditional household makeup, or who are less fortunate, still receive equal treatment as citizens? Are homeless persons seen as less than citizens because they do not have a fixed address? Contributing to the state's economy through ownership or renting and building wealth can take time and requires stability. It can also be a considerably larger challenge for émigrés entering a new country for the first time, and for some who experience difficulty functioning within the norms of society. Does every Canadian have the choice to rent, own, or gain equal access to the resources needed to be active, contributing members of society within this framework?

As all three Censuses ask the amount of hours worked per week, amount of weeks worked per year etc., meaning is constructed out of how much time one is contributing to the Canadian labour market. Thus, to be an active citizen is to have a job, be searching for a job

and/or contributing a certain amount of hours. The type of employment an individual embarks on can also be a marker of their identity. It is clear that employment can be a measure of success; however, what obstacles could English, French, or émigré citizens in certain parts of Canada face? Are equal opportunities for employment available for all types of citizens?

A subject must first be comfortable functioning in the language and culture of the population specific to the city, town, province, country of residence, and so on. Subjects must also have the qualifications or the experience to have access to certain jobs. For émigrés, this can often result in the acquisition of blue-collar jobs. It takes time and, typically, Western work experience for émigrés to integrate into white-collar, professional positions. Further, it is important to investigate how the politics of identity influences which citizens receive what jobs and to what degree one must negotiate their cultural identity to function within dominant society.

When the Census poses questions regarding the type of job and skills a subject has, the questions typically give examples of specialized jobs, or government jobs, which may be unattainable for the disenfranchised or minority population<sup>xxx</sup>. The 1991 Census asked, “What kind of work was this person doing? For example, medical lab technician, accounting clerk, manager of civil engineering department, secondary school teacher, supervisor of data entry unit, food processing labourer, fishing guide (If in the Armed Forces, give rank only.)”, or what were their main duties or responsibilities. These jobs are presented as average jobs according to Canadian citizenship; however, they do not reflect self-employment, self-taught, more “precarious”, or jobs that are stereotypically filled by immigrants - i.e. taxi driver, house cleaner, etc. Even if émigrés have a particular skill set or education, if it was obtained in a foreign country it is unlikely to be recognized to the same degree as if the experience

was obtained in the Western world. Skill sets must be accompanied by the capability of being able to work in Canada, overcoming language barriers, cultural barriers, or a lack of certified or recognized credentials.

The 2006 Census questionnaire addressed two additional themes that the 1971 and 1991 Censuses do not. First, it focused on how many hours of unpaid work an individual is doing whether childcare, elderly care, or caring for one's home, or the home of another. Secondly, the Census narrowed in on what language was used in the workplace, English or French, or if any other language was used other than English or French. The 2006 Census measured the time that individuals are spending on personal care for others and themselves, including housework, and taking care of responsibilities that do not create revenue for the population. The additional question of what languages are used in the workplace not only gauges the demand or popularity of the official languages, but can gauge how much of the population is ascribing to either language and which of the two languages is being used more often. Which official language is thriving more amongst the working population? The incorporation of asking whether other languages are being used in the workplace acknowledges the diversity of culture and languages in Canada. This could possibly require new policies or ideologies to be put in place to cater to a population.

**Education.** The marker for education within the Census gathered information on individuals' attendance and completion of elementary, secondary, and post-secondary school. Meaning and inferences can be evaluated by asking questions of the level and type of education different members of society are receiving, and in what fields. As education is a factor of social capital, it is important to investigate what the Census is concerned with in

terms of the educational expectations for Canadian citizens. What is involved in forms of systematic teaching in Canada?

Although elementary school is compulsory for all people on Canadian soil, this was not always the case. The Census of 1971 and 1991 posed questions related to the highest level of schooling, whether it was attended, and if it was completed. The 2006 Census however, focused on the completion of various levels of school degrees rather than just the subject's attendance. In addition, the standard expectation of completion for education systems appears to be secondary school by 2006. This is reflected in the first question of education, which asked if the subject had completed secondary high school or equivalent. This assumes that the subject completed the compulsory primary or elementary school. Now secondary school becomes the new normative expectation of what a person should receive. Furthermore, the compulsory primary and secondary education from educational institutions standardizes what and how individuals learn, and in what language. All students attending school learn the same material within the same educational structure. To what extent does this cater to the different cultural and language needs in Canada?

As post-secondary education can be costly, and often requires an application process and acceptance, it becomes exclusive to individuals who can afford to attend and who have the resources to invest in an education instead of earning money through employment. Education also poses challenges for those who are not comfortable in using English or French, or who experience challenges integrating into society. Based on this notion, education seems most attainable for those mastering one of the two dominant languages/cultures. Further, these systems of knowledge and institutions become the only way to recognize education. It is relevant to note for interculturalism that the 1991 and 2006

Census questions regarding education referenced CEGEP<sup>xxxii</sup> - which is schooling exclusively in Quebec - and recognized the province's different schooling system.

Location of education is also a factor and can be relevant in relation to school institutions. The location of educational institutions can pertain to different locations of meaning. Towns, cities, provinces, and countries can dictate the status or accreditation of the education that subjects receive, as some schools are renowned for certain subjects, or for being of high calibre. Therefore, the location (place) of the educational institution can influence the recognition of the degree obtained and thus influence the status of the individual who obtained that credit. Education received abroad (typically out of North America and the Western World) in some cases does not receive the same recognition or credentials. Émigrés who received their formal schooling outside Canada can become less valued if their education was not obtained under a recognized school system, according to the nation-state's education standards.

The different types of schooling degrees themselves form a system of ranking. To attach education as an identifier would place subjects into a constructed hierarchy in society and rank them within a system of meaning. Accordingly, levels and degrees of education can reinforce social hierarchies and value systems, as seen through classifying the population into such groups in the Census questionnaires.

**Origin.** Canadian citizens can originate from different provinces within the country, or from multiple countries around the world, whether it is the individual themselves, parents, or ancestors. The place of birth of an individual within Canada is important for marking the density and cultural experiences of the population in different provinces. An immigrant's place of birth determines how many citizens were born in Canada, and how many were born

in another country, or have national, cultural, ethnic, or citizenship ties to additional countries. While the entire population is proclaimed as being equal members, the Census asks whether the subject was born in Canada, or other parts of the world, in order to determine whether the subject is *from* Canada, or émigrés with Canadian citizenship. This in itself creates an essentialized form of Canadian-ness and categories of meaning through ethnic, cultural, and citizenship identity. Canada's national composition reflects and is concerned with information about the ethnic backgrounds of all citizens, including whether the subject's ancestors are English or French, were founders of the country, or if they originated elsewhere themselves.

Asking about parents' place of birth determines which generation of Canadian the subject falls under, whether first, second or third, and can also reflect the level of a subject's integration into society. This question is also able to collect information on Canada's diversity population, and can build the story of different ethno-cultures in the country. In 1971 and 1991 Censuses, the question asking where the subject was born gave North American and European choices to select, or the choice to mark 'Other' – clearly indicating a Eurocentric framework of thought. In 2006, the option was to indicate if the subject was born outside Canada and to specify the country, unlike in 1971 and 1991 Censuses where the options were to choose from U.S.A., U.K., Poland, Germany, or Italy. If the subject was born outside of Canada, they were automatically classified as part of the immigrant population. Asking this question is a representation of the need to identify identity differences in the population. The Census asks the birthplace and background of parents and ancestors, which reflects that subjects are still being asked and identified by the background of their ancestors, even after having been in Canada for generations.

In the 1971 Census, the origin question that asks the subject what country they are a citizen of gave the option of choosing Canada, U.K., U.S.A., or Other, with one line to indicate another citizenship. It also contained a Eurocentric framework that can further alienate individuals born in a more foreign country. However, the 1991 and 2006 questionnaires allowed the subject to choose multiple citizenships that apply to them, which recognizes the possibility of multiple national experiences. The latter demonstrates positive progress in the direction of acknowledging the possibility of transnational citizenship experiences, as it expanded from considering a once singular conceptualization of citizenship to the possibility of having multiple. The 1991 and 2006 questionnaires also further categorized Canadian citizenship into two groups: a citizen by birth, or by naturalization<sup>xxxiii</sup>, in which a person had to undergo the process of becoming a Canadian citizen and was encouraged to integrate into society. According to the citizenship questions in 1991 and 2006, there was a recognition that individuals can have multiple citizenships, and can be born in a country but possess citizenship of another country as well as Canadian citizenship. These questions begin to acknowledge the possibility of multi-layered, complex forms of identity.

The Census questions regarding the culture and ethnicity of individuals and their background conflate the use and term of ethnicity and culture and use them interchangeably. This indicates a lack of clarity in the conceptualization of these relevant concepts in relation to characteristics of identity and culture in Canada. These characteristics, however, are almost automatically associated with immigration.

The landed immigration questions in 1991 and 2006 regarding the year that a subject immigrated were used to identify the non-immigrant population (Canadians by birth), from the immigrant population. Responding 'yes' to such a question immediately categorizes

citizens as immigrants. Citizenship in Canada is then divided into two groups: one as a national citizen, and the other as an immigrant citizen. However, marking belonging to an ethnic group negates citizenship by birth and still categorizes a subject as émigrés, even having been born in Canada. Cultural and ethnic backgrounds of individuals do not fade away as a cleavage in identity, even as a Canadian citizen.

It is clear to see dominant European representation in earlier Census questionnaires, which evolved into a more diverse set of representations from different countries, lost in the management of the multiplicity of cultures. Even as Canadian citizens, the population is being categorized and identified as immigrants, while still possessing Canadian citizenship. This is being done not only through the question of whether subjects are landed immigrants, but by distinguishing the presence of another separate population when asking the individuals' place of birth, ethnic origins, and the origins of parents, and ancestors. Ancestors are defined as past the generation of grandparents, as per the 2006 Census. Generations later, subjects are still being considered as different rather than as "pure" Canadian. Questions of ethnic and cultural origins are predicated on the enumeration of visible minorities in Canada's population.

**Social.** The social marker of citizenship serves as a description of the subject's characteristics and patterns in relation to the structure of the state. Social characteristics and norms are depicted through this marker, and can be considered important elements of the nation-state, as the information gathered can affect policies, programs, and future projections.

In each Census, the relationship to the head of the household was asked, followed by a series of options to choose from, and examples of what the relationship might be. It ranged

from sister, aunt, brother-in-law, lodger, or family member of lodger. This question sets the criteria of typical relationships in households and how members relate to each other, where there is always a “head” of the residence. Members of the household are accounted for in relation to this person. It sets a framework of types of relationships and lays out traditional correlated roles and titles of people who live together. However, how do individuals identify themselves when circumstances do not fall under these categories? For example: a family that lives with another family or friends, or having an unconventional household. What is the purpose of creating these household relationships? It is interesting to note that the 1971 Census question suggested as a guideline that the head of household is the husband rather than the wife, or in the event of unmarried children, the head of the household be the parent. These social guidelines suggest patriarchal hierarchies within family life.

The question of sex: male or female was a reoccurring question within the Census, which determined gender positions of individuals within society. There are often assumed roles between society and the individual, and between society and the family, based on the sex of the individual. Thus, knowing whether the population is male or female for the purpose of organizing and structuring society is relevant, as subjects typically have distinct ties to groups. However, it can limit the conceptualization of self-identification of some individuals. How does the category of sex account for individuals who have a complex relationship, who do not easily fit into the socially accepted categories of male/female? To what extent are transgender, transsexual, or intersex subjects represented as Canadian citizens within the questionnaire? This question fails to acknowledge members of the population who fall outside of, or have a complex relationship with, the category of sex and gender. If not for socially constructed gender roles, to what extent is it necessary to understand the sex of the population; especially in an age where childbirth rates are low, and

common-law and same sex partners exist, adding further complexity to understanding birth rates through the statistics of male or female population members?

Collecting data on the date of birth of individuals assists in understanding the age of the population and how to accommodate for different factors such as school, day care, and healthcare. Gathering data on age can be used to make projections and set programs to reach out to the needs of society. These characteristics divide the population into groups and subgroups in order to understand trends and life-habits.

Marital status is also a reoccurring question within the Census. It depicts social relationships that create behavioural assumptions, creates criteria for relationships, and accommodates the characteristics of society. The state presents marital labels and categories to which subjects can identify with, depending on their scenario. In the 1971 Census, the options of marital status were as follows: single not married, widowed, divorced, and separated. These are the choices of how the subject could classify themselves, within these boundaries. Whereas 2006 presented the following options: never legally married (single), legally married and not separated, separated but still legally married, divorced, widowed. A category of being “separated” was added to the questions, creating a new socially and legally accepted dimension of status related to marriage to which a subject in the population can partake. The 2006 questionnaire additionally introduced a new dimension to extend the boundaries of the marital relationship label. Canadian discourses on marital status adapted and included the possibility of having a life-partner outside of legal marriage called a common-law partner. Introducing the common-law status also presented a platform for same-sex couples to identify their relationship, and be recognized within the Canadian societal structures as partners outside of legal marriage.

The ability to converse in an official language is placed in the social category because it is necessary in order to thrive in Canada. English and French are the languages in which the majority of the country socializes, and it is crucial to learn at least one in order to function in the public sphere. Learning the dominant language of society is critical in the process of integration and to accessing any type of interaction or service from the state. English and French languages are placed as the social norm in Canada and are involved in every question in the Census, in opposition to other languages. The Census asks whether the individual has conversation capabilities in the official language, as it is a minimum function whether for education, employment, or social activity. It becomes a duty and responsibility to learn one of the two official languages for people of all backgrounds, and specifically to increase a sense of belonging.

The social marker of citizenship also asks women the number of children they have given birth to. This can be a way to understand the population and the trends in which women are having children. It also places an emphasis on women's role in parenthood and may deemphasize the role of the father or male figure in the birth and nurturing of a child; women are primary caretakers as men are not considered a factor in the question of childbirth in the Census. The 1971 Census question does not legitimize the children of unmarried mothers, as it asked the question only for women who are married. The 1991 Census removed the notion of marriage when posing this question, creating an inclusive count regardless of marital status, while the 2006 Census did not pose this question at all.

Questioning each marker individually provides an analysis of the types of meaning that can be inferred about the identity markers. They individually compile a dimension of conceptualization for citizenship; put together, they depict a vision of not only how Canada structures society, but also what the important attributes are for the Canadian population. The

analysis of these markers also displays how the Government of Canada conceptualizes identity characteristics, the terms of their relationship to society, and how people create meaning of themselves. To what extent is Canada's inclusive citizenship and Quebec's civic citizenship represented in the analysis of Canadian citizenship?

### **Cross-Referencing**

The investigation of scholarly literature discussed vital questions regarding cultural diversity in Canada specifically by outlining Canadian multiculturalism and Quebec interculturalism policies. Being born into or obtaining citizenship is accompanied by expectations and assumptions based on the legal and social obligations of status alone. As seen in the methodology, it was necessary to investigate the challenges of static notions of Canadian citizenship against competing national discourses of multiculturalism and interculturalism, to understand whether the claims of discourses surrounding the two policies could be substantiated through the markers of the Census; specifically because multiculturalism and interculturalism were designed to meet the needs of citizens.

The analysis of the content and the ideologies imbedded in Census questions directly and inadvertently create problematic meanings for one's identity. This section questions the markers in order to understand potential limitations that the conceptualization of citizenship may have on the formation and process of identification in Canada, specifically for a diverse population. The discursive content analysis continues by comparing the markers to each other to demonstrate their interrelated relationship and the conditions they create, before examining the markers with the literature to gain a better understanding of the discursive practices of citizenship and identity in Canada. Lastly, the markers and literature are

compared with the application of individual experience to showcase the complexities that are encountered in identification.

### **Units of Analysis - Markers vs. Meanings**

As the citizenship markers were individually explored, cross-referencing them allows for the analysis of what the markers say about each other. How do the markers intersect to impact the conditions of a Canadian citizen? How is meaning formed and constructed through these categories and articulations of identity?

The mixed methodology of a discursive content analysis was used to first deconstruct and operationalize the markers to analyze the content in the Census. The use of a discourse analysis is used to uncover meaning in the markers in relation to Canada's sociopolitical context within the analysis of Canadian ideologies embedded in multiculturalism and interculturalism.

Within the cultural marker of citizenship, language acquisition and use in both the public and the private life of a subject is a broad theme that connects to all other markers. Determining the mother tongue of a subject relates to their origin, and whether they speak English, French, Aramaic, or Mandarin, as it is the first language that a subject acquires. Different provinces in Canada are more inclined to speak certain languages, particularly the French language in Quebec, whereas other provinces have a French speaking population, and others are predominantly English. Even if the subject is born in Canada and speaks a 'foreign' language, urban cities in Canada are also more likely to contain a population group from other parts of the world. Thus, mother tongue, as a cultural marker, is closely linked to the marker of origins, whether national or immigrant. Language is also used as a marker for integration and is necessary for education, economic, and social belonging to the dominant

society.

Questions of whether the subject can speak English or French well enough to conduct a conversation can also reference the origins of the subject, in terms of which province in Canada they originated from, and often which country. Further, this question references the subject's public life and is also related to the social marker of citizenship, as either official language is required to function in Canadian society. Therefore, the conversational ability of an official language is crucial for access to education, as Canadian institutions deliver education primarily in English all over Canada, with the exception of Quebec where education is mainly in French, and less so with existing French schools in the rest of Canada. Official languages spoken are also applied to the economic marker, as the majority of the time either language is necessary to interact, read, or write with fellow Canadians. Lack of knowledge of either language can significantly hinder employment opportunities and the types of employment available to a subject. However, the workplace language characteristics may be adjusting to the diverse population, as the 2006 Census questionnaire asks what language is used, if it is other than English or French, and in the subject's job or workplace.

It can be argued that the religion of an individual can act as a signifier of one's culture or origins. Religion can thus be a differentiating characteristic that can subjugate groups in relation to popular mainstream religions. For example, Christianity, more specifically Catholicism and its denominations in Canada, vis-à-vis religions that stem from, but that are not limited to, different parts of the world from which non-White émigrés originate (e.g. Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, Sikhism, etc.). Although these faiths are not necessarily narrowly tied to specific countries, they can physically represent the origins or regions of an individual's identity, and be an indication of cultural and ethnic difference. Religion itself is often accompanied by identity markers and can be conflated

with race. For example, categorizing individuals who speak Arabic or who are from the Middle East under the Islamic faith. The language a subject most often speaks at home also links to place of origin as the family life of émigrés, for example, contains many cultural values that are either confined to home life, or expressed by those with similar cultural experiences. Thus, the language most often spoken at home is indicative of one's origin or background.

The economic marker of citizenship is related to wealth and ownership and also has direct ties with education. Not only can education provide the formal credentials needed for certain employment opportunities, but also both economic and educational markers can reflect the degree of success in a society. Achievements in the employment and education realm are indicators of quality of life, builders of self-esteem, and can contribute to a sense of belonging - particularly for émigrés. These two dimensions of citizenship have direct interactions with institutions and the society at large, and generally require successful integration. Further, one's economic status influences one's access to education, as the quality of education received can be more costly, specifically regarding the price of tuition for post-secondary education. When an individual or their family is not financially stable, it can influence whether or not an individual can afford not to work and pay for education. Often times immigrant families will require more members of the household to work to make more income, as migrating to a new country can present financial challenges of beginning a life in a different country and building it up. The failure of émigrés to integrate into societal norms can result in income and educational inequality when compared with the privileged population.

Within the social meaning of citizenship, certain markers can vary depending on the culture of an individual. For example, when regarding the relationship to the head of

household, it is common practice for some cultures to live within their parents' home at an older age, as well as living with a grandparent. Some cultures are more inclined to live with aunts, uncles, and cousins, while others may be more likely to have an employee or lodger living with the family.

The sex of an individual is also influenced by culture, as gender roles can be constructed differently from culture to culture. Similar comparisons can be made with the marital status of an individual. Certain cultural traditions can emphasize the importance of marriage more than others, at a different age, as well different means of finding a partner (i.e. through arranged marriages).

While the cultural marker asks the languages of origin and foreign languages spoken, the origin marker asks about ethnic and cultural background, the subject's citizenship, whether their citizenship occurred by birth or by naturalization, and the year the subject immigrated to Canada. As seen through the frequency of questions in the Census, one's cultural background and the background of one's ancestors are high on the agenda of citizenship, particularly where Canada's cultural differences are policed by multiculturalism. The language of origin in Quebec's particular case is more important versus the rest of Canada, as the literature noted in chapter two. Quebec's immigration process differed from the rest of Canada, as the province prioritized the acceptance of immigrants from Francophone regions around the world to encourage French language integration in Quebec. Whereas Canada did not place preference on particular origin or background in relation to language competency, Quebec does favour linguistic over ethnic selection for immigrants.

The education marker is interested in how much education a subject received, the highest year of school, the type of degree obtained, where it was obtained, and in what field of study. While the economic marker is interested in whether the subject is employed, the

amount of hours/weeks worked, whether the subject searched for work, and through what kind of institutions. It asks for the subject's income from various sources, the payment of living quarters, and how many hours of unpaid work.

Thus, it is observed that different cultural experiences in Canada and different backgrounds impact the relationship to the markers of citizenship. These all provide tokenized markers of identity and representations created by the state that reference cleavages in identity and a racialized identity. All social factors are a large part of identification as social markers and the head of household's cultural relationships may dictate a different dynamic of relationships within households.

### **Citizenship Markers vs. Literature**

The literature on multiculturalism and interculturalism has demonstrated that cultural identity has been bounded and essentialized, which limits the dynamic of meaning-making for individuals. Some of the ways in which this can be seen from chapter two is through Bhabha's (1990a) argument that multiculturalism attempts to control the dynamic process of articulating cultural difference, while Benessaieh (2010) states that both models of interculturalism and multiculturalism are based on cultural boundedness and descend from the view of cultures as essential. Salée (2007) also notes the dissatisfaction and disadvantaged feelings of minority groups in Quebec who view the state as unable to fulfill promises of "social justice, fairness, and self-determination". He also further identifies a gap between Euro-descendants and ethnocultural minority groups. This is also reflected in the power relationships in the reasonable accommodation debate in which Mahrouse (2010) argues that the interculturalism model of a civic citizenship is within the confines of ensuring that cultures are not so diverse that they impede on Quebec's cultural practices; where

Quebec's civic citizenship for émigrés extends as far so as to not infringe on Quebec cultural priorities.

The literature also indicated that regardless of which policy, the émigré population was left marginalized and disadvantaged within the population overall under a system of inclusion and exclusion. The analysis of Canadian citizenship through the Census questions does not seem to provide different conclusions from these results. The content analysis of the Census displayed clear distinctions between normative Canadian cultural practices, and those that can be considered "foreign". The Census also demonstrated a preference for Euro-descendent characteristics in some questionnaires, and displayed the clear categorization of cultural classifications in all the Censuses. Further, the origin of an individual and their ancestors was also relevant in each Census, which could identify an individual from immigrant decent.

The following section explores what the literature captures about the markers of citizenship and Canadian identity formation. This will allow the findings of the markers in relation to Canadian citizenship to be interpreted, and to substantiate the markers of the Census to the literature on Canadian diversity discourses. Further, this section will discuss epistemological tensions in the conceptualization of identity in Canadian citizenship to demonstrate identity limitations of multiculturalism and interculturalism.

Statistics Canada data shows that the most important markers for Canadian identity formation in this case are culture and origins, as they directly characterize the cultural and ethnic identity of the émigré population vis-à-vis the national population. The social marker is an important tool to present national demographic characteristics, while economic and education markers are a form of measuring access and integration, which can result in privileges and exclusions in the population.

**Culture.** Cultural diversity in multiculturalism is a fundamental part of Canadian citizenship and a large part of the Canadian cultural marker. Cultural identity can be described as parts of our identities, which emerge from our “belonging” to distinctive ethnic, racial, linguistic (English, French, or any other language), religious, and/or national cultures (Hall, 1996, p. 596). Is our current citizenship paradigm able to support the diverse linguistics, ethnic, racial, religious, and cultural backgrounds that enter state boundaries? Through this concept of citizenship, we are able to analyze the degree to which émigrés are incorporated into host nations, and the degree to which their identity must be negotiated in order for émigrés to incorporate themselves into society (Bloemraad et al., 2008, p. 154). Cultural experiences in Canada thus do impact the formation of identity development.

According to Hall (1992), identity was created as a construction, with the use of labels as a way of referencing, which often creates the experience of racism and marginalization (p. 252). What has occurred is a single and unifying framework of identities across ethnic and cultural difference, between different communities becoming hegemonic over other ethnic racial identities, creating an invisible and unspoken ‘other’, consisting of mainly White cultural discourse.

The question of authenticity (e.g. origin) and the fixation of cultural characteristics are often present within the discussion of multiculturalism (Spivak, 1990, p. 59). Individuals’ being encompasses different dimensions or representations, including how they are seen and how they see themselves. These representations can be deduced by where subjects are placed, and what position they manifest (Spivak, 1990, p. 60). Thus, our identity can emerge through conceptualization of what others have created, which impacts how we arrange and structure our lives (Parekh, 2006, pp. 2-3).

Regimes of representation in a culture play a constitutive role and not merely a reflexive one (Hall, 1992, p.254). Hegemonic voices present in society construct the notion of authenticity – in this case ‘Canadianity’ - in which something is always left out, which allows identity experiences to be represented in a certain way. It is these constructed authenticities, which are generally known, that reflect a dominant view of what is deemed authentic or normative. An authentic migrant is constructed and often a sense of tokenism emerges as a way to understand individuals (Spivak, 1990, p. 61).

The racialization of identity, including culture and ethnicity, is also present in popular discourse, as these “essentialized assumptions of difference have been written into our language and communication patterns” (Kobayashi and Johnson, 2007, p. 5). All non-Whites are positioned as ‘Others’ in Canada’s multicultural ideology, which equates Canadian-ness with Whiteness (Taylor, James & Saul, 2007, p. 165). And Whiteness as a social construct can only gain meaning when in contact with non-White individuals. It is not until deconstructing dominant discourse of Whiteness that one can highlight the powerful yet invisible powers involved (Nakayama & Martin, 1999, p. xii).

Ibrahim (2011) argues that the term ethnicity can be interpreted differently depending on time and socio-political contexts; however, it is often used interchangeably with the term race. Ibrahim states “...today the term is often reserved to differentiate “us” from “them”<sup>xxxiv</sup>. The usage of “ethnicity” in such a way presents questions of “power dynamics” that associates the term with differentiation and boundaries of, or from, the “other” (p. 12). If we outline ethnic identity formation as constitutive of one’s environment, and the involvement of multiculturalism frameworks in daily life, we can detect representations of race, culture, and nationality as limiting categories of measuring individual experience.

**Economic.** The economic position evaluates the worth of an individual in society and their success. The economic structure of a nation-state is associated largely with the politics of recognition (Parekh, 2006, p. 2). Thus, the immigrant-marginalized population faces forms of economic inequality. According to Hiebert (2005), low-income rates are generally much higher for Canadians of non-European origin in comparison to the total population, partially because a high number of that population is immigrants. Additionally, “the percentage of the population experiencing low income is almost twice as high for visible minorities as for those not in that category” (p. 35)<sup>xxxv</sup>. This further reflects the problematic of the representation of identity in multicultural nations, and how it hinders earnings in society. Thus, job segregation and income inequality is present in Canada under the multiculturalism and interculturalism regimes of diversity management, and suggests “complex stories of social, political, and economic inequality (Kobayashi and Johnson, 2007, p. 4). Émigrés function under the White backdrop, which inherently results in their disadvantage in the economic sphere, as reflected in employment and income inequality. The basis of this disadvantage is the social construction of identity and the politics involved in cultural, ethnic, and racial difference.

Economic factors also contribute to the practice of immigrant selection. The focus has increasingly been on attracting immigrants that are self-sufficient, and “who can pay the costs of their own integration and contribute to Canada’s global competitiveness” before becoming an immigrant and eventually a citizen (Abu-Laban, 2004, p. 22).

**Education.** As education in modern, liberal-democratic nation-states is compulsory, schools play a significant role in the social construction of these values and works modern liberal-democratic values into the curriculum, which structures a school’s culture and social

environment (Seljak, 2003, p. 64). Thus, educational institutions play a large role in the perpetuation of the ideals and discourses of the nation-state. The policies, programs, curriculum, and pedagogies in the practice of multicultural education have proved to be insufficient in Canada, particularly regarding “the diverse needs, concerns, issues, and aspirations of marginalized students” (James, 2007, p. 17).

Scholars who are concerned with racial equity have argued that schools contain “hidden curriculum” that embodies Western or “White” values. These values are considered as “ways of knowing – as normative or superior to those of racial and ethnic minorities” - and influence the social environment of the schools, as well as the culture and structure of the environment<sup>xxxvi</sup> (Seljak, 2003, p. 65). However, it is the group “minoritized” by the dominant culture that can likely result in feelings of alienation from the culture of their school. These discriminations that are based on identity markers such as class, ethnicity, race, gender, and so on create more narrow life-opportunities for these types of students (Seljak, 2003, p. 65). Thus, émigrés face greater obstacles within the educational system, and experience challenges of belonging. Could revisiting the institutionalized form of knowledge to incorporate multicultural ideals into Canadian curriculum make it more inclusive for diverse identities and equate a better version of equality?

Education is important, as it can be a signifier of status and can contribute to hierarchy, self-fulfillment, success, and belonging. It can disadvantage those who may not have resources such as language, and/or financial access to educational institutions. The level and type of education received can reflect an individual’s level of integration into society, and whether they can function within conventional structures. Obstacles to integration into the labour market and educational system do thereby generate inequality (Bloemraad et al., 2008, p. 161).

**Origins.** Public perceptions have shifted in the categorization of immigrants as ethnic or as otherwise over the past years, according to Ali (2008). In Canada, the public discourse about immigrants often conflates race and ethnicity - and as we have seen in the Census questions, culture and immigrants are essentialized primarily by their racial characteristics, and their ethnicities are considered fixed. Ali (2008) indicates that this interpretation denies dynamic meaning-making and creates a dialectical and ongoing process of negotiation wherein individuals either find common ground, or distinguish themselves from others through the natural use of cultural practices and representations. Further, even as groups that are different from each other with regards to language, religion, and socio-political systems, they are amalgamated as a result of their phenotypic features (pp. 93-94). Thus, their identity is stereotyped and often stigmatized based on physical characteristics, creating a constant negotiation that limits the meaning that occurs, due to the restricting identity ideologies represented in discourse. To what extent then does the latter occur as a result of the limited conceptualization of ethnic and cultural backgrounds? Do the English and French “ethnic/cultural groups” experience the same type of stereotypes based on physical and cultural identity?

Kobayashi and Johnson (2007) state that “Canadian society is a landscape of negotiation, in which skin colour takes on multiple shades of meaning.” As individuals inhabit this landscape, culture, ethnicity, and physical characteristics are used to assign to places and positions to fix identities. It is reoccurring every day, and is constantly reinforcing meaning (p. 3). These identity positions are occurring in a dialectic representation articulated by dominant Canadian culture. In the Canadian context, the multicultural discourses that present Canada as a culturally neutral society that embraces *all* cultures is in fact contradicted by consistent presentation and construction of ‘Canadians’ as White (Taylor et

al., 2007 p. 157). Jiwani (2006) describes Canadian society as one with invisible White powers, with inequalities - one of which is structured on the basis of race - and common sense grounded in White dominance (p. 4). Additionally, Jiwani (2006) discusses contemporary multiculturalism as the context in which race-based hierarchies are grounded (p. 11). There is indeed a distinction then between national citizens and immigrant citizens.

For individuals who cannot access Canadian citizenship through birth, which is the case for the majority of international migrants, citizenship must be acquired through naturalization (Bloemraad et al., 2008, p. 156). Abu-Laban (2004) describes post-September 11 conditions in policy responses in Canada as “serving to segment Canadian citizenship in an explicit fashion.” According to Abu-Laban (2004) this involves “the more overt imposition of hierarchies based variously on: place of birth; race, ethnicity, or religion; presumed race, ethnicity, or religion; and holding more than one citizenship” (p. 19). Thus, based on questions in the Census, members with visible émigré characteristics are being treated differently based on their cultural and origin identity characteristics as immigrants.

**Social.** The social marker of citizenship demonstrates different characteristics of the population to depict social habits and trends of social life, including family makeup. More importantly, the fertility and birth rates that have been collected through the Census have a direct impact on the size of the population and the age structure; differential fertility is crucial as a factor in the evolution of the composition of the population (Bélanger et al., 2005, p. 4). The characteristics that were in the social marker of citizenship, such as mother’s age, marital status, area of residence, and markers of culture and origin play a role in the probability of childbirth. Further, Bélanger et al., (2005) indicates that an analysis that was

conducted displayed in part, that women who are recent immigrants are likely to be more fertile than other women in the population (p. 4).

In order to immigrate to Canada, there are a series of questions and tests that accompany the application process. Bélanger et al., (2005) states that a number of studies have shown immigrants have a lower mortality than native-born Canadians. According to Bélanger et al., (2005) “higher life expectancy is generally attributed to a selection effect, since landed immigrants are required to undergo a medical examination before they arrive in Canada” (p. 4). The immigration process is selective in choosing who can immigrate, before they are actually admitted, and attempts to make the best choice of which migrants will not burden social and economic systems while choosing who could potentially be most beneficial to the state.

Acquisition of the dominant language of the host society is often used as a marker of integration, which is usually agreed upon by immigrants. It can facilitate many things including political and civic participation, and social interaction with fellow citizens, as well as other things such as economic advancements (Bloemraad et. al, 2008, p. 169). One of the main forms of successful integration and belonging is through the acquisition of English or French language, as they are the official and dominant languages in Canada and part of the social marker of citizenship. Speaking either of the two languages is crucial to functioning within the nation-state; however, as discussed in chapter three, Salée (2007) contends that many minorities have the capacity to function comfortably in either language, but still remain subordinate (pp. 119-120).

We have seen that identity is constructed through representations in a way that influences self-identification, and that there are hegemonic powers influencing these representations. Identities are being racialized, often creating a disenfranchised population

within the overarching articulations of race and ethnicity. Thus, nation-states intervene in the populations' articulation and process of identification.

The literature and the markers of citizenship are deeply embedded in the practice of 'Othering', in both multiculturalism and interculturalism policies, which is especially visible in the marker of culture and even more so in the marker of origin. Identifying with "foreign" language, citizenship, country of birth, ethnicity, or ancestry immediately positions a subject as an alien Other. In both multicultural and intercultural nation-states, there are distinct differences in how White Canadians are viewed and treated versus émigrés. Being fluent in one of Canada's official languages does not remedy any of the above.

### **Citizenship Markers & Literature vis-à-vis Experience**

Frameworks set out for the population and abiding within normative practices directly and indirectly impacts actions and how we make sense of identity. The concern for this research is not whether Census questionnaires are effective in reaching their objective of compiling statistics, but rather what is being communicated. How are Census questions constructing meaning for the articulation of Canadian identity, and is this framework providing a citizenship of inclusivity?

As observed, the construction of Canadian citizenship encourages identifying with specific categories whether it is the type of citizenship acquired, country of birth, cultural background, ethnicity, or mother tongue and languages still spoken. Census questionnaires situate clear categorizations of aspects of personal cultural identity, limiting the process and dynamic of meaning-making rather than providing an experience based on personal agency. This dynamic process of identity could be represented in multiple ways. For example, my personal experience shows complexities of national and cultural experiences and what kind

of obstacles can be faced as limitations in the traditional notion of Canadian citizenship.

The Census questionnaire asks the birthplace of both parents within the marker origin. My father, who was born in Lebanon, holds Lebanese citizenship and lived in Lebanon until the late 1980s. My mother, who was also born in Lebanon, possesses Lebanese citizenship, and immigrated to Canada when she was three years old. She obtained Canadian citizenship through naturalization. She lived the majority of her life immersed in Canadian society and culture from a young age and spent significantly more of her life in Canada than my father; thus there is a difference in both my parents' exposure and acquisition of the Canadian culture. Yet, they have the same mother tongue, belong to the same religion, the same languages are spoken at home, their ethnic and cultural ancestry is the same, and they are both able to converse in at least one of Canada's official languages, as well as in another language. To what extent is their Canadian cultural experience different?

Through my mother, I inherited Canadian citizenship and through both my parents, I inherited Lebanese citizenship. Recent Census questionnaires allow the subject to account for multiple citizenships. When the Census poses the question of whether I am a citizen by birth, or by naturalization, by definition I am a Canadian citizen by birth, as I did not have to immigrate and apply for citizenship. However, I was not born in Canada and experienced dimensions of immigration upon coming to Canada. To what extent then am I a Canadian citizen by birth or by naturalization? Furthermore, it can be argued that even if a subject obtains Canadian citizenship by birth, as soon as they identify with ancestry outside of English or French Canada, or Euro-descendants (non-White), they can be categorized as "immigrant".

My mother moved back to Lebanon where she married my father and lived there for ten years. In the time my mother lived in Lebanon, she and my father bore three children;

however, she had travelled back to Canada to give birth to the eldest child and then returned to Lebanon where the other two children were later born. Thus all three children have both Canadian and Lebanese citizenship; however the place of birth of the eldest is Canada, whereas the two younger siblings were born in Lebanon.

At the age of two my family and I “re-immigrated” to Canada. We had to re-immigrate because my father had to undergo the process of acquiring Canadian citizenship, and my family, including two other siblings, faced cultural, educational, economic, and social obstacles that immigrants can experience upon entering a host-country. My father was the principal of a high school in Lebanon, but held a labour job in Canada as a result of various obstacles, one of which was not language as he was fluent in English. My mother restarted a new life in Canada; she did not have a career, did not own a home, or have the means to purchase or rent immediately. Thus my immediate family lived with my mother’s parents, my grandfather as the head of the household. During this transition, my Arabic speaking siblings and I experienced the barrier of language, and were encouraged to refrain from speaking Arabic in order to catch-up in our language skills with the rest of the English population our age. Thus, to some degree, our mother tongue that was first spoken may not be understood to the same extent as it once was. Further, there existed the negotiation of how to separate home life (culture) from public life (social).

The fourth and final sibling was born in Canada. To recap, the eldest and youngest siblings were born on Canadian soil and the middle children were born in Lebanon. To what degree am I considered an immigrant in comparison to my brothers who were born in Canada? Is our cultural experience different as siblings? How do these questions reflect the cultural experience of the individual? The eldest sibling returned to Canada at the age of eight, whereas the youngest sibling was born in Canada. How do their cultural experiences in

general differ from the siblings born in Lebanon? Did the youngest have an easier time integrating and adapting in Canada than the eldest? What about the middle siblings? One of the two felt greater ease integrating in society while the other arguably experienced more challenges. Do the current means of identifying and conceptualizing Canadian citizenship represent the dynamic experiences of the population? Or are their clear lines/categories that interrupt the contextualization of identification experiences?

My family's experience of back and forth travel does not fall within what is considered "normal" for Canadian citizenship and immigration to Canada. However, this is not uncommon, especially in the age of globalization where physical travel is not as great of an obstacle as it once was, and the interconnectedness of language and culture allows for a tighter link between multiple countries and cultures. Individuals and families are commuting between different areas of the world, with different ethnicities experiencing cultures with different citizenships. Is Canadian citizenship designed to take such conditions into consideration? Does the conceptualization of these oversimplified categories of identity result in other inequalities that neither multiculturalism nor interculturalism address?

Let us extend the story and add another factor to take the anecdote further in displaying possible complexities of identification, and the limited boundaries set by current Canadian citizenship. What if my Lebanese-Canadian mother married my Lebanese father and moved to Venezuela and spent ten years raising a family and after ten years, decided to immigrate to Canada. Thus the narrative continues... I would be of Lebanese origin, with experience of the Venezuelan culture, and hold Canadian citizen. To what extent then does measuring citizenship through clear linear groups interrupt individuals as agents rather than categories of difference?

It is observed that even individuals born in Canada can experience cultural and social

obstacles. It can also be assumed that émigrés who adapt with more ease into the dominant culture are likely to have an easier time with education and employment, resulting in higher education and employment opportunities in Canada. The latter describes an individual émigré who is “Canadianized” - a common vernacular term used to describe individuals who have more easily integrated and adapted into Canadian society. Whereas for other émigrés born in Canada, or arriving at a young age, cultural and social conventions and norms can remain a conscious decision, a negotiation of what degree to display which cultural characteristics under which circumstances.

Although more recent Census questions allow a subject to classify themselves under more than one ethnic, cultural, or citizenship characteristic, they are still categorized under a limiting normative framework. When deconstructing the content and context of the Census questionnaires, do they apply and reflect the identity experiences of my family as an example? If not, who are the questions directed towards and what are they aiming to achieve if not an accurate representation of the identity experiences of the population? Census questions in this case are not actually a representation of the conditions of individuals’ experiences, rather oversimplified assumptions that create a problem for the existence of the politics of difference over diversity.

At the centre of multiculturalism and interculturalism are simplified and confining forms of racialized identity discourses manifested in power relations that fail to account for complex versions of individual nuances of identity. The current Canadian diversity models fail to acknowledge identity as complex, as well as the possibility of different articulations and *re*-articulations of individual identity. Rather, instrumental categories of identification are in place, that pose challenges in dynamic heterogeneous populations, to which transnational and transcultural identity conceptualizations may serve. Thus, the current

concepts and models for understanding and managing identity have been demonstrated as erroneous and fail to consider dynamic and complex articulations of identity over current essentialized categories.

#### **Chapter 4 – Final Conclusion**

This research was concerned with uncovering challenges in Canadian cultural discourses, and the meaning and formation of identification (such as national, cultural, and ethnic) of a diversified population as seen through the multiculturalism and interculturalism policies for managing diversity. More specifically, this research investigated the potential impact of these discourses and policies on conditions and cultural identity development of émigrés in Canada. The findings are applicable and generalizable to other countries and relevant to various issues, disciplines, and contentious environments. To work towards equal coexistence and cohesion among individuals with different identities and allegiances in the world, countries, communities, groups, families etc., it is necessary to understand identification as ongoing, and to contextualize subjects outside predetermined stereotypes - to accept people as individuals and not attach categories to differentiate groups from others.

Citizenship was used in the case of Canada to enumerate identity challenges within an émigré country with two national cultural agendas in order to investigate nationality, culture, and ethnicity, and how they influence identification.

The research concludes that citizenship allegiances can lay out identity boundaries and conceptualizations that influence the meaning-making of national, ethnic, or cultural identity. Identity formation and conceptualization is not the concern or priority of the Census, rather the Census creates the condition of Canadian citizens. Exploring these conditions enables us to conceptualize the roots of identity formation of Canadian citizens.

The way in which Canadian society is organized creates a grid to manage the identities of individuals. Policies such as multiculturalism and interculturalism were put in place to create structure and order within a democratic society that does not nurture the autonomy of individuals. These policies have a contingent effect on the relationship of

groups towards structures of power within society. To what extent then can the nation-state's organization result in privileging members of certain groups while marginalizing others?

Furthermore, as the Census poses questions about ancestry and ethnicity of individuals, we must ask if an individual can identify with a culture or ethnicity to which they do not historically "belong". For example, someone born and raised in Canada must identify themselves with the background of their parents or ancestors, to which they may have no experience or allegiance. These types of classifications limit and taint the historical and present contact of individuals with Canadian culture. It appears that citizenship tries to function as a framework for positioning nationality, to unify all identity differences and divisions in Canada together.

However, what about the cultural tensions between Anglophone Canada and Francophone Quebec, and the difference between multiculturalism and interculturalism, cultural identity, and citizenship? Quebec considers itself historically one of the two founding groups in Canada and desires recognition as an autonomous nation, which they strengthen by their own agenda. However, Canadian citizenship does not account for Canada as a multinational state, and an inclusive Canadian citizenship does not provide Quebec such recognition, according to the literature review and the representation in the markers of citizenship in the Census. Thus, Quebec too is bounded within the state as they do not receive the degree of recognition and independence from Canada, and Canadian-state institutions do not foster Quebec's vision of independence or the province's version of civic citizenship. These complexities cannot be represented by Canada's current notion of citizenship.

Based on the analysis of citizenship in the Census, it is challenging to find representations of either a multicultural or an intercultural citizenship within the markers.

Both civic and ethnic inclusive citizenships, as proclaimed by the interculturalism and multiculturalism policies, are not reflected in the identity discourses in the Census, and markers. Citizenship is not being depicted as inclusive and ethnicity has not been removed from the equation. Can a civic version of citizenship for Quebec and different versions of Canadian citizenship be reflected in the state? Further, do multiculturalism and interculturalism differ in everyday applications? Does this infer that citizenship experiences are the same for any émigré living anywhere in Canada? This thesis attempts to uncover the differences between multiculturalism and interculturalism, to understand the nature of cultural discourses in Canada, to identify the strengths and weaknesses of these Canadian tools for policing identity, and suggest potential areas for improvement. The literature maintains that although multiculturalism and interculturalism policies emerged at different times and under different conditions, their application merely stems from different narratives.

Opening limited notions of identity, in this case Canadian identity, has discerned identification as an ongoing process with no fixity that can yield itself to external pressures of society as a reflexive process. Postmodernism as an analytical tool facilitated the investigation of articulations of Canadian identity and the possibility of illustrating dynamic meaning based on experience, opening an essentialized “Canadian-ness”, whereas nationality is applied to represent and structure different identities as a collective.

As cultural and ethnic challenges of diversity surface in Canada, the models that emerge as a result become crucial to population recognition and equal opportunity, including different versions of nationality, how émigrés are accepted in a nation, and whether multicultural/intercultural citizenship can exist while upholding universal rights and equality for all. Both interculturalism and multiculturalism emerged as a means to police cultures in an attempt to ensure social cohesion. This produced a Canadian discourse of inclusive

citizenship for all ethnicities and cultures. However, this dualistic nature of Canada's historical emergence, manifested through Quebec's yearning for recognition, initiated an interculturalism policy that incorporates the civic nature of citizenship for Quebec society. Ethnicity is removed from interculturalism discourses, and language and cultural development is confined to Quebec's ideals. More important than the ethnicity of an individual for Quebec is whether they speak the French language and have the social capital to embrace Quebec's cultural agenda in the future.

While Canadian multicultural citizenship promotes rights and equality for all, Quebec takes the stance of reasonable accommodation of cultural diversity. However both policies proclaim integration as key to their formula for cohesion of diversity. Language is a key component of integration and belonging for social, cultural, educational, or economic factors, whether English and French bilingualism, or Francophone interculturalism for the case of Quebec. English and/or French are necessary to function within the public sphere to gain access to privileges and integration in Canada. However, this research demonstrates that language acquisition alone does not resolve issues of belonging and cohesion for émigrés; there are cultural obstacles as well. Can émigrés be considered equal constituents of the population within a structure of a mainstream status quo to which émigrés must participate? To what extent then is this form of integration not without dimensions of assimilation? Does this not disqualify integration as an appropriate solution to equality and belonging for all ethnic and cultural groups? The literature uncovered that regardless of which narrative, both interculturalism and multiculturalism leave minority groups at a disadvantage.

By examining the Census questionnaires and the markers of citizenship that surfaced through the questions, the research was able to empirically test the findings of Canadian identity discourses from the theoretical analysis of multiculturalism and interculturalism. The

findings were important as they displayed that Canada's tools for addressing issues of diversity contained uncertainty regarding multiculturalism and interculturalism's objectives and conclusions, and problematic discourses which did not remedy identity cleavages. Individual agency was questionably not functional in a liberal democracy such as Canada where essentialized categories of representations construct identity into groupings. The analysis of citizenship substantiated this claim by displaying identity classifications and dominance in the questionnaires, creating an Othering process for any culture or ethnicity existing outside the dominant norm.

Through integration or assimilation, émigrés are encouraged to not only embody characteristics of the dominant culture, but they are categorized as different through their backgrounds, and indirectly forced to assume categories of identity established through the dominant Canadian discourses reflected on the Census questionnaires. If identity is reflexive and contingent on cultural narratives, then to what extent do Canadian multiculturalism and Quebec interculturalism policies intervene in the meaning-making process of cultural and national identities of émigrés?

If émigrés are encouraged to identify with customs of the host country in public, would this not indirectly encourage one to abandon parts of his or her background in order to integrate and belong?

Ethnic, cultural, and citizenship identity experiences are limited to what Canadian discourses conceptualize as normative. Thus, multiculturalism and interculturalism are creating conditions of inequality, disenfranchising groups through hegemonic powers creating a homogenized population. This creates a limited representation of a heterogeneous population, neglecting the representation and rights of Others. To what extent then are

identity differences celebrated and not used to divide as stated by the formal multiculturalism texts in Canada?

Neither multiculturalism nor interculturalism have a blueprint of what or *how* the policies are to succeed in their objectives of equality and respect for diversity, specifically regarding émigrés relations; yet they have a strong base of adherents and supporters. This is particularly problematic for multiculturalism, as it has a history of ambiguity. There is a need to contextualize factors shaping identity and specifically a need to seek a deeper understanding of the multilayered, multidimensional and ongoing process of identification.

One way would be to consider transnationalism and transculturalism as a means of transcending current Canadian socially constructed categories to embody fluid identity formation. The conclusion of this research suggests opening both multiculturalism and interculturalism to different conditions of possibility with the concepts of transnationalism and transculturalism. My personal identity experience suggests that there is further complexity that current conditions of multiculturalism, interculturalism, and citizenship cannot reflect.

Transnationalism or transnational communities are of importance to the contemporary understanding of the citizenship perspective so that members of other nations can have strong and frequent ties, and maintain those ties, with their country of origin. Duncan (2003) states transnational subjects may have no intention of replacing or superseding their attachment to their “homeland” with their new host-society (p. 79). These attachments are not supported by the current Canadian citizenship paradigm wherein “the Canadian oath of citizenship incorporates a swearing allegiance that presumes singularity of this allegiance,” though it is possible for citizens to have dual or multiple places of belonging, or cultures of belonging. Legislation, including the *Charter of Rights and*

*Freedoms*, and the *Multiculturalism Act*, are designed to foster a sense of inclusiveness for all while expecting that citizens will “assume full membership in Canadian society” and consider it as their primary, if not their single home (p. 79). Transnationalism breaks the barrier of the single national identity and origins.

According to Benessaieh, (2010) transculturality “suggests alternative ways of relation to otherness”. There is a need to empirically study the latter further, to understand cultural globalization “from an agent-centered, day-to-day perspective” which nurtures different views of culture as dynamic and contextual (p. 29). Transculturality is derived from theoretical perspectives that consider cultures as relational and dynamic to subjects and can be understood “as a cross-culture competence”. It is an identity that is cohesive, that transcends barriers for individuals and communities who consider their self-identification as “continuously shifting between cultural flows and worlds” rather than by identification with a singly monolithic culture (Benessaieh, 2010, pp. 28-29).

Thus, a recommendation for future research would be to consider a paradigm shift for citizenship, to transcend traditional accounts of nationality and culture, and incorporate transnational and transcultural experiences. A multicultural and intercultural framework that would explore facets in which transnational and transcultural notions can be included in Canadian cultural discourses to account for subjective forms of identification. The Canadian multiculturalism debate can be viewed as a micro level example that reflects tensions between global cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization - universal vis-à-vis particular (McLellan & Richmond, 1994, p. 671). Identity problems are not policy based, but theoretically rooted in the politics of identity.

Dimensions of inclusion and exclusion, and privileged and marginalized population groups are currently present in Canadian discourses; however, these groups are not attributed

to the framework for citizenship itself or to diversity management policies, but characterizations of identity that are imbedded in the politics of diversity. We are configuring identity discourses in a limited way and tying differentiating, “authentic”, universal characteristics under steep binary categories against White dominant frameworks of thought.

Whiteness can be seen an unconscious habit, in which privilege operates as seemingly invisible or unseen, as if it were non-existent; white privilege is a habit constituted by one’s environment as a disposition for interacting with the world (Sullivan, 2006, pp. 1, 3). This environment effects diverging identities differently, but the habits are composed in negotiation within a world that privileges White people and operates in somewhat of a covert way (Sullivan, 2006, p. 3). As identities are constructed as normative, deconstructing dominant discourses assists in breaking down “common-sense” barriers.

Thus, is race the distinguishing factor that separates identities in society? As discussed in chapter one by Hall (1996), representations naturalize identity, making race a common-sense construction. Therefore, identity is covertly racialized and embedded in society. Race itself is *discursive* and not biological; genetic difference thus cannot be used to distinguish between one another as differences are based on constructions of identity (p. 617). Hall (1996) describes race as the category that organizes ways of speaking, “systems of representation, and social practices (discourses) which utilize loose, often unspecified set of differences in physical characteristics... as symbolic markers in order to differentiate on group socially from another” (p. 617). Canadian cultural identity is being categorized based on perilously constructed racial attributes, rather than historicized or contextualized experiences.

The issue regarding Canadian identity discourses is not multiculturalism or interculturalism as policies; it is a problematic of the politics of identity and diversity

discourses. There is resistance to accepting people as different, rather than celebrating similarities and not focusing on population members who are not the same. If national identities serve to unite differences in a population, then to what extent will cultural differences ever be embraced? Or does the population wish to have sameness and familiarity within the confines of nationality?

Categories of meaning are the way we make sense of our identities and surroundings; they are indeed necessary. Classifications of identity are not negative in themselves; however, problems arise when we are unable to move past generalizations, blocking individuality and agency. To overcome the slope of the politics of diversity would require emancipation from the boundedness of classifications. The intent is to view one another as individuals, and not oversimplify the attributes or representations of group identities that are institutionally appointed.

**Appendix A - Markers of Citizenship in the 1971, 1996, 2001 Census of Canada Questionnaires**

**1971**

Cultural	Economic	Education	Origins		Social
			National	Immigrant	
<p><b>Mother Tongue: Language FIRST spoken and STILL UNDERSTOOD:</b> Only one is to be chosen. English, French, German, Italian, Other (specify)</p>	<p><b>Is this dwelling: OWNED</b> or being bought by you (or a member of his household)? <b>RENTED</b> (even if no cash rent is paid to the landlord)?</p>	<p><b>Have you attended school or university since last September?</b> Full-time, Part-time, No</p>	<p><b>Where were you born?</b></p> <p><i>If born IN Canada, mark the province... Nfld., P.E.I., N.S., N.B., Que., Ont., Man., Sask., Alta., B.C., Yukon, N.W.T.</i></p> <p><i>Otherwise mark country according to present boundaries</i> U.K., Germany, Italy, Poland, Rep. of Ireland, U.S.A., Other.</p>		<p><b>Relationship to head of household.</b> <i>The HEAD of household is: the husband rather than the wife; the parent where there is one parent only, with unmarried children; or any member of a group sharing a dwelling equally.</i> Head of household, Wife of head, Son or daughter or head, Father or mother, Brother or sister, Son-in-law Daughter-in-law, Father-in-law Mother-in-law, Brother-in-law Sister-in-law, Grandchild, Lodger, Lodger's wife, Lodger's child, Nephew or niece, Other (specify) as <i>uncle, aunt, employee, employee's wife, employee's child, partner.</i></p>
<p><b>What is your religion?</b> Anglican, Baptist, Greek Orthodox, Jewish, Lutheran, Mennonite, Pentecostal, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, Salvation Army, Ukrainian Catholic, United Church, No religion, Other (write here).</p>	<p><b>Did you own or rent your PREVIOUS dwelling in Canada?</b> Owned, Rented, Lived in no other dwelling in Canada, Not HEAD of household.</p>	<p><b>What is the HIGHEST grade or year of elementary or secondary school you have ever attended?</b> No schooling, Kindergarten, Grade __</p>	<p><b>Were your PARENTS born IN Canada?</b> Both, Neither, Mother only, Father only.</p>	<p><b>If born OUTSIDE of Canada, in what period did you first immigrate?</b> Before 1931, 1931-1945, 1946-1950, 1951-1955, 1956-1960, 1961-1964, 1965, 1966, 1967-1968, 1969, 1970, 1971.</p>	<p><b>Sex; fill one circle only.</b> Male or Female</p>
<p><b>What language do you MOST OFTEN speak at home now?</b> English, French, German, Indian, Italian, Magyar, Netherlands, Polish, Ukrainian, Yiddish, Other (specify)</p>	<p><b>Does any member of this household own a vacation home?</b> (Include only those used mainly for personal use. Do not include trailers or any other mobile homes.) No vacation home, One vacation home, Two or more vacation home.</p>	<p><b>Where did you attend your HIGHEST grade of elementary or secondary school?</b> This Province, Outside Canada, No Schooling, Other Province (specify)</p>	<p><b>Of what country are you a CITIZEN?</b></p> <p>Canada</p> <p>U.K., U.S.A., Other (Spot for one)</p>		<p><b>Marital status:</b> Single (never married), Now married, Widowed, Divorced, separated.</p>
<p><b>To what ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestor (on the male side) belong on coming to this continent?</b> English, French, German, Irish, Italian,</p>	<p><b>When did you last work at all, even for a few days?</b> In 1971, In 1970, Before 1970, Never worked.</p>	<p><b>How many years of schooling have you had since secondary school?</b> University → None or 1,2,3,4,5,6+</p>	<p><b>To what ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestor (on the male side) belong on coming to this continent?</b></p>		<p><b>Month and Year of birth</b></p>

Jewish, Native Indian – Band, Native Indian – Non-band, Netherlands, Norwegian, Polish, Scottish, Ukrainian, Other		Other → None or 1, 2, 3+	English, French, Native Indian – Band, Native Indian – Non-band, German, Irish, Italian, Jewish, Netherlands, Norwegian, Polish, Scottish, Ukrainian, Other (specify)	
<b>Can you speak English or French well enough to conduct a conversation?</b> English only, French only, Both English and French, Neither English nor French	<b>How many hours do you usually work each week?</b> 1-19, 20-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50 or more	<b>Do you have a university degree, certificate or diploma?</b> <i>Mark highest academic qualification.</i> No university degree, certificate or diploma, Yes, a university certificate or diploma (below bachelor level), Yes, Bachelor degree, Yes, a Master's or equivalent, or earned doctorate (e.g. Ph.D., Ed.D.)		<b>Can you speak English or French well enough to conduct a conversation?</b> English only, French only, Both English and French, Neither English nor French
	<b>For whom did you work?</b> Name or firm, governmental agency, etc. _ _ Department, branch, division, or section _ _ _ _ Industry.			<b>Where did you live 5 years ago?</b> Same dwelling, Same city, town, village or municipality in Canada, Outside of Canada, Different city, town, village or municipality in Canada, give its name
	<b>What kind of business, industry or services was this?</b> <i>A full description, e.g. paper-box mfg., road construction, retail shoe store.</i> a) What kind of work are you doing? b) What were your most important activities or duties? c) What was your job title?			<b>How many times have you MOVED from one Canadian city, town, village or municipality to another in the past five years?</b> <i>Count moving away and returning to the same place as 2 moves.</i> None, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or more.
	<b>In how many weeks did you work during 1970?</b> <i>Include weeks worked part-time, leave with pay and weeks of self-employment.</i> Did not work, 1-13, 14-26, 27-39, 49-52 Was this work mainly full-time or part-time?			<b>For PERSONS ever married:</b> What was the date of your first marriage?
	<b>What was your total income during 1970 from various sources?</b>			<b>For WOMEN ever married:</b> How many babies have you had, not counting stillbirths? None, numbers 1-13 and 14 +
				<b>For MEN 35 years of age or over:</b> Did you have any wartime service in the active military forces in Canada or allied countries? Yes, WWI or earlier, Yes, WWII or in Korea, No wartime service

1991

Cultural	Economic	Education	Origins		Social/Civic
			National	Immigrant	
<p><b>Can this person speak English or French well enough to conduct a conversation?</b> English only, French only, Both English and French, Neither English nor French</p>	<p><b>Last week, how many hours did you work (not including volunteer work, housework, maintenance or repairs for his/her own home)?</b> Number of hours __ Or None.</p>	<p><b>What is the highest grade (or year) of secondary (high school) or elementary school this person ever attended?</b> Enter highest number (1 to 13) of grades or years, excluding kindergarten. Enter number 1-13 Or Never attended school or attended kindergarten only</p>	<p><b>Where was this person born?</b> Mark or specify only, according to present boundaries?</p> <p><b>In Canada:</b> Nfld., Man., P.E.I., Sask., N.S., Alta., N.B., B.C., Que., Yukon., Ont., N.W.T.</p>	<p><b>Outside Canada:</b> United Kingdom, Italy, U.S.A., West Germany, East Germany, Poland, Other – Specify.</p>	<p><b>Describe relationship to Person 1.</b> Mark one circle only. If you mark the circle "Other", use the box provided to indicate this person's relationship to Person 1. Examples of "Other" persons <i>related</i> to Person 1: cousin, grandfather/grandmother, son's common-law partner, nephew/niece. Examples of "Other" persons <i>not related</i> to Person 1: lodger's husband/wife or common-law partner, lodger's son/daughter, roommate's son/daughter, employee. Husband/wife, Common-law partner, Son/daughter, Son-in-law/daughter-in-law of Grandchild, Father/mother, Father-in-law /mother-in-law, Brother/sister, Brother-in-law/sister-in-law of Lodger/boarder, Roommate, Other Specify.</p>
<p><b>What language(s), other than English or French can this person speak well enough to conduct a conversation?</b> None or Other *Space for three options</p>	<p><b>Last week, was this person on temporary lay-off or absent from his/her job or business?</b> Mark one circle only: No, Yes, on temporary lay-off from a job to which this person expects to return, Yes, on vacation, ill, on strike, or locked out, or absent for other reasons.</p>	<p><b>How many years of education has this person completed at university?</b> None, Less than 1 year (of completed courses), Number of completed years at university.</p>	<p><b>Of what country is this person a citizen?</b> Mark more than one circle, if applicable.</p> <p>Canada, by birth</p>		<p><b>Date of Birth:</b> If exact date is not known, enter best estimate.</p>
<p><b>What language does this person speak most often at home?</b> English, French, Other.</p>	<p><b>Last week, did this person have definite arrangements to start a new job within the next four weeks?</b> No, Yes</p>	<p><b>How many years of schooling has this person ever completed at an institution other than a university, a secondary (high school) or an elementary school?</b> Include years of schooling at community colleges, institutes of technology, CEGEPs (general and professional) private trade schools or private business colleges, diploma schools of nursing etc.</p>	<p>Canada, by naturalization, Same as country of birth (other than Canada), Other country</p>	<p><b>Is this person now, or has this person ever been, a landed immigrant?</b> No - Go to Question, Yes - Continue with Question 14</p>	<p><b>Sex:</b> Male Female</p>
<p><b>What is the language that this person first learned at home in childhood and still understands?</b> If this person no longer understands the first language learned, indicate the second language learned. English, French, Other</p>	<p><b>Did this person look for work during the past four weeks?</b> For example, did this person contact a Canada Employment Centre, check with employers, place or answer newspaper ads? Mark one circle only. No, Yes, looked for full-time work, Yes, looked for part-time work (less than</p>	<p><b>In the past nine months (that is, since last September), was this person attending a school, college or university?</b> Mark only one circle: No, did not attend in past nine months, Yes, full time, Yes, part time, day or evening</p>	<p><b>In what year did this person first become a landed immigrant in Canada?</b> If exact year is not known, enter best estimate.</p>	<p><b>Legal Marital Status</b> Mark one circle only: Legally married (and not separated), Legally married and separated, Divorced, Widowed, Never married (single).</p>	

	30 hours per week)			YEAR	
<p><b>To which ethnic or cultural group(s) did this person’s ancestors belong?</b><sup>1</sup>  <i>Mark or specify as many as applicable:</i> French, French, German, Scottish, Italian, Irish, Ukrainian, Chinese, Dutch (Netherlands), Jewish, Polish, Black, North American Indian, Métis, Inuit/Eskimo, Other ethnic or cultural group(s) – specify *Space for two options. <i>Examples of other ethnic or cultural groups are: Portuguese Greek, Indian from India, Pakistani, Filipino, Vietnamese, Japanese, Lebanese, Haitian, etc.</i></p>	<p><b>Could this person have started work last week had a job been available?</b>  <i>Mark one circle only.</i> Yes, could have started work, No, already had a job, No, temporary illness or disability, No, personal or family responsibilities, No, going to school, No, other reasons</p>	<p><b>What certificates, diplomas or degrees has this person ever obtained?</b> <i>Mark as many circles as applicable:</i> None, Secondary/high school graduate certificate or equivalent, Trades certificate or diploma, Other non-university certificate or diploma (obtained at community college, CEGEP, institute of technology etc.), University certificate or diploma <b>below</b> bachelor level, Bachelor’s degree(s), University certificate or diploma <b>above</b> bachelor level, Master’s degree, Degree in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine or optometry, Earned doctorate.</p>	<p><b>To which ethnic or cultural group(s) did this person’s ancestors belong?</b><sup>2</sup> <i>Mark or specify as many as applicable:</i> <i>Examples of other ethnic or cultural groups are: Portuguese Greek, Indian from India, Pakistani, Filipino, Vietnamese, Japanese, Lebanese, Haitian, etc.</i></p>	<p><b>Can this person speak English or French well enough to conduct a conversation?</b> English only, French only, Both English and French, Neither English nor French</p>	
<p><b>What is this person’s religion?</b>  <i>Indicate a specific denomination or religion even if this person is not currently a practicing member of that group. For example, Roman Catholic, Ukrainian Catholic, United Church, Anglican, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Baptist, Pentecostal, Greek Orthodox, Jewish, Mennonite, Jehovah’s Witnesses, Salvation Army, Islam, Buddhist, Hindu, Sikh. Specify one denomination or religion only Or No religion.</i></p>	<p><b>When did this person last work, even for a few days (not including volunteer work, housework, maintenance or repairs for his/her own home)?</b> In 1991, In 1990, Before 1990, Never work in lifetime</p>	<p><b>What was the major field of study or training of this person’s highest degree, certificate or diploma (excluding secondary or high school graduation certificates)?</b> <i>For example, accounting, carpentry, civil engineering, history, legal secretary, welding:</i> Major field of study or training ____ Or This person’s highest qualification is a secondary/high school graduation certificate.</p>	<p>English, French, North American Indian, Métis, Inuit/Eskimo</p>	<p>German, Scottish, Italian, Irish, Ukrainian, Chinese, Dutch (Netherlands), Jewish, Polish, Black, Other ethnic or cultural group(s) – specify *Space for two options.</p>	
					<p><b>Where did this person live 1 year ago, that is, on June 4, 1990?</b> <i>Mark one circle only.</i> Lived at the same address as now, Lived in the same province territory, but at a different address, Lived in a different province/territory in Canada: Print name of province/territory, Lived outside Canada: Print name of country.</p>

<sup>1</sup> **Note:** While most people of Canada view themselves as Canadian, information about their ancestral origins has been collected since the 1901 Census to reflect the changing composition of the Canadian population and is needed to ensure that everyone, regardless of his/her ethnic or cultural background, has **equal opportunity** to share fully in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada. Therefore, this question refers to the origins of this person’s **ancestors**.

<sup>2</sup> **Note:** While most people of Canada view themselves as Canadian, information about their ancestral origins has been collected since the 1901 Census to reflect the changing composition of the Canadian population and is needed to ensure that everyone, regardless of his/her ethnic or cultural background, has **equal opportunity** to share fully in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada. Therefore, this question refers to the origins of this person’s **ancestors**.

	<p><b>For whom did this person work?</b> <i>Name of firm, government agency, etc. Department, branch, division, section or plant</i></p>			<p><b>Did this person live at this present address 5 years ago, that is, on June 4, 1986?</b> Yes, lived at the same address as now as now, No, lived at a different address</p>
	<p><b>What kind of business, industry or service was this?</b> <i>Give a full description. For example, wheat farm, trapping, road maintenance, retail shoe store, secondary school, temporary help agency, municipal police.</i></p>			<p><b>Where did this person live 5 years ago, that is, on June 4, 1986<sup>3</sup>?</b> <i>Mark one only.</i> Lived in the <b>same</b> city, town, village, township, municipality or Indian reserve <b>OR</b> Lived in a <b>different</b> city, town, village, township, municipality or Indian reserve. (Specify details) <b>OR</b> Lived <b>outside</b> Canada. <i>Print name of country.</i></p>
	<p><b>At what address did this person usually work?</b> <i>If street address is unknown, print the name of the building or (including farms) nearest street intersection. Some large cities are made up of smaller cities or towns called municipalities. Where applicable, distinguish between municipality and the large city, such as Anjou and Montreal, Scarborough and Toronto, Burnaby and Vancouver, Saanich and Victoria. Worked at home (including farms), Worked outside Canada, Worked at the specified address below.</i></p>			<p><b>For WOMEN only:</b> How many children were <b>ever born to this person?</b> <i>Count all children, including those who may have died since birth or who may now be living elsewhere. Do not include stillbirths.</i> None Or __ Number of children</p>
	<p><b>What kind of work was this person doing?</b> <i>For example, medical lab technician, accounting clerk, manager of civil engineering department, secondary school teacher, supervisor of data entry unit, food processing labourer, fishing guide (If in the Armed Forces, give rank only.)</i></p>			
	<p><b>In this work, what were the person's most important duties or activities?</b> <i>For example analyzing blood samples verifying invoices, co-coordinating civil engineering projects, teaching mathematics, organizing work schedules and monitoring data entry systems, cleaning vegetables, guiding fishing</i></p>			

<sup>3</sup> Some large cities are made up of smaller cities or towns called municipalities. Where applicable, distinguish between the municipality and the large city, such as an Anjou and Montréal, Scarborough and Toronto, Burnaby and Vancouver, Saanich and Victoria.

	parties.			
	<b>In how many weeks did this person work in 1990?</b>			
	<b>During most of those weeks, did this person work full time or part time?</b> Full time (30 hours or more per week), Part time (less than 30 hours per week).			
	<b>Is this dwelling owned by a member of this household</b> (even if it is still being paid for)? <b>Rented</b> (even if no cash rent is paid)?			
	<b>Total income from various sources?</b>			

2006

Cultural	Economic	Education	Origins		Social
			National	Immigrant	
<p><b>Can this person speak English or French well enough to conduct a conversation? Mark one circle only.</b>                      English only, French only, Both English and French, Neither English nor French.</p>	<p><b>Last week, how many hours did this person spend doing the following activities:</b>                      None, Less than 5 hours, 5 to 14 hours, 15 to 29 hours, 30 to 59 hours, 60 hours or more</p>	<p><b>Has this person completed a secondary (high) school diploma or equivalent?</b>  <i>Examples of secondary (high) school equivalency certificates are General Educational Development (GED) and Adult Basic Education (ABE).</i> Yes, secondary (high) school diploma, Yes, secondary (high) school equivalency certificate, No</p>	<p><b>Of what country is this person a citizen?</b>  <i>Indicate more than one citizenship if applicable.</i></p>	<p><b>Immigrant</b>                      Canada, by naturalization<sup>4</sup>, Other country — Specify.</p>	<p>Sex: Male or Female</p>
<p><b>What language(s), other than English or French, can this person speak well enough to conduct a conversation?</b>                      None OR Specify other language(s).                      *Space for 2 options</p>	<p><b>Doing unpaid housework, yard work or home maintenance for members of this household, or others?</b> <i>Some examples include: preparing meals, washing the car, doing laundry, cutting the grass, shopping, household planning, etc.</i></p>	<p><b>Has this person completed a Registered Apprenticeship or other trades certificate or diploma?</b> <i>Mark as many circles as applicable. For example: hairdressing, CNC machinist</i>                      Yes, Registered Apprenticeship certificate,                      Yes, other trades certificate or diploma,                      No.</p>		<p><b>Is this person now, or has this person ever been, a landed immigrant?</b> <i>A “landed immigrant” (permanent resident) is a person who has been granted the right to live in Canada permanently by immigration authorities.</i> No, Yes.</p>	<p><b>Date of Birth:</b> <i>If exact date is not known, enter best estimate.</i></p>
<p><b>What language does this person speak most often at home?</b> English, French, Other — Specify. (One)</p>	<p><b>Looking after one or more of this person’s own children, or the children of others, without pay?</b>  <i>Some examples include: bathing or playing with young children, driving children to sports activities or helping them with homework, talking with teens about their problems, etc.</i></p>	<p><b>Has this person completed a college, CEGEP, or other non-university certificate or diploma?</b> <i>Mark as many circles as applicable. For example: accounting technology, real estate agent, industrial engineering technology.</i> Yes, certificate or diploma from a program of less than 3 months, Yes, certificate or diploma from a program of 3 months to less than 1 year, Yes, certificate or diploma from a program of 1 to 2 years, Yes, certificate or diploma from a program of more than 2 years, No.</p>		<p><b>In what year did this person first become a landed immigrant?</b> <i>If exact year is not known, enter best estimate.</i></p>	<p><b>MARITAL STATUS.</b> <i>Mark one circle only.</i> Never legally married (single), Legally married (and not separated), Separated, but still legally married, Divorced, Widowed.</p>

<sup>4</sup> “Canada, by naturalization” refers to the process by which an immigrant is granted citizenship of Canada, under the Citizenship Act.

<p><b>Does this person speak any other languages on a regular basis at home?</b> No, Yes, English, Yes, French, Yes, Other — Specify. (One)</p>	<p><b>Providing unpaid care or assistance to one or more seniors?</b> <i>Some examples include: providing personal care to a senior family member, visiting seniors, talking with them on the telephone, helping them with shopping, banking or with taking medication, etc.</i></p>	<p><b>Has this person completed a university degree, certificate or diploma?</b> <i>Mark as many circles as applicable.</i> University degree, certificate or diploma, Yes, certificate or diploma below bachelor level, Yes, bachelor's degree, Yes, certificate or diploma above bachelor level, Yes, master's degree, Yes, degree in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine or optometry, Yes, earned doctorate, No.</p>	<p><b>Where was each of this person's parents born?</b> <i>Mark or specify country according to present boundaries.</i></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1304 264 1497 456"> <p><b>Father, Mother:</b> Born in Canada</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1503 264 1686 456"> <p><b>Father, Mother:</b> Born outside Canada, Specify country</p> </td> </tr> </table>		<p><b>Father, Mother:</b> Born in Canada</p>	<p><b>Father, Mother:</b> Born outside Canada, Specify country</p>	<p><b>Is this person living with a common-law partner?</b> <i>Common-law refers to two people of the opposite sex or of the same sex who live together as a couple but who are not legally married to each other.</i> Yes, No.</p>
<p><b>Father, Mother:</b> Born in Canada</p>	<p><b>Father, Mother:</b> Born outside Canada, Specify country</p>						
<p><b>What is the language that this person first learned at home in childhood and still understands?</b> <i>If this person no longer understands the first language learned, indicate the second language learned.</i> English, French, Other — Specify. (One)</p>	<p><b>Last week, how many hours did this person spend working for pay or in self-employment?</b> <i>Please enter the total number of hours worked for pay or in self-employment at all jobs held last week. Include: working for wages, salary, tips or commission; working in his / her own business, farm or professional practice, alone or in partnership; working directly towards the operation of a family farm or business without formal pay arrangements (e.g., assisting in seeding, doing accounts).</i> Number of hours (to the nearest hour) OR None.</p>	<p><b>What was the major field of study of the highest degree, certificate or diploma that this person completed?</b> <i>Please be specific. For example: automobile mechanics, civil engineering, dental technology, aircraft mechanics, medical laboratory technology, day-care, agricultural economics</i> OR No certificate or diploma (higher than high school).</p>	<p><b>Where was this person born?</b> <i>Specify one response only, according to present boundaries.</i></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1304 532 1497 943"> <p><b>Born in Canada:</b> Nfld., Lab., Manitoba, P.E.I., Sask., N.S., Alberta, N.B., B.C., Quebec, Yukon, Ontario, N.W.T., Nunavut.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1503 532 1686 943"> <p>Born outside Canada, Specify country</p> </td> </tr> </table>		<p><b>Born in Canada:</b> Nfld., Lab., Manitoba, P.E.I., Sask., N.S., Alberta, N.B., B.C., Quebec, Yukon, Ontario, N.W.T., Nunavut.</p>	<p>Born outside Canada, Specify country</p>	<p><b>For each person usually living here, describe his/her relationship to Person 1.</b> <i>Mark or specify one response only. Stepchildren, adopted children and children of a common-law partner should be considered sons and daughters. If none of the choices apply, use the "Other" box to indicate this person's relationship to Person 1. Examples of "Other" relationships: cousin, niece or nephew, lodger's husband or wife, room-mate's son or daughter, employee, same-sex married spouse. Husband or wife, Common-law partner, Son or daughter, Son-in-law or daughter-in-law, Grandchild, Father or mother, Father-in-law or mother-in-law, Grandparent, Brother or sister, Brother-in-law or sister-in-law, Lodger or boarder, Room-mate, Other — Specify</i></p>
<p><b>Born in Canada:</b> Nfld., Lab., Manitoba, P.E.I., Sask., N.S., Alberta, N.B., B.C., Quebec, Yukon, Ontario, N.W.T., Nunavut.</p>	<p>Born outside Canada, Specify country</p>						
<p><b><sup>5</sup>What were the ethnic or cultural origins of this person's ancestors?</b> <i>An ancestor is usually more distant than a grandparent. For example, Canadian, English, French, Chinese, Italian, German, Scottish, East Indian, Irish, Cree, Mi'kmaq (Micmac), Métis, Inuit (Eskimo), Ukrainian, Dutch, Filipino, Polish, Portuguese, Jewish, Greek, Jamaican, Vietnamese, Lebanese, Chilean, Salvadorean, Somali, etc.</i> Specify as many origins as applicable using capital letters. * Space for 4 spaces.</p>	<p><b>Last week, was this person on temporary lay-off or absent from his / her job or business?</b> <i>Mark one circle only.</i> No, Yes, on temporary lay-off from a job to which this person expects to return, Yes, on vacation, ill, on strike or locked out, or absent for other reasons.</p>	<p><b>In what province, territory or country did this person complete his / her highest degree, certificate or diploma?</b> In Canada: Specify province or territory OR Outside Canada Specify country.</p>	<p><b>What were the ethnic or cultural origins of this person's ancestors?</b> <i>An ancestor is usually more distant than a grandparent. For example, Canadian, English, French, Chinese, Italian, German, Scottish, East Indian, Irish, Cree, Mi'kmaq (Micmac), Métis, Inuit (Eskimo), Ukrainian, Dutch, Filipino, Polish, Portuguese, Jewish, Greek, Jamaican, Vietnamese, Lebanese, Chilean, Salvadorean, Somali, etc.</i> Specify as many origins as applicable using capital letters.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1304 1243 1497 1313"> <p><b>Born outside Canada:</b> Specify country.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1503 1243 1686 1313"> <p>* Space for 4 spaces.</p> </td> </tr> </table>		<p><b>Born outside Canada:</b> Specify country.</p>	<p>* Space for 4 spaces.</p>	<p><b>Can this person speak English or French well enough to conduct a conversation?</b> <i>Mark one circle only.</i> English only, French only, Both English and French, Neither English nor French.</p>
<p><b>Born outside Canada:</b> Specify country.</p>	<p>* Space for 4 spaces.</p>						

<sup>5</sup> The census has collected information on the ancestral origins of the population for over 100 years to capture the composition of Canada's diverse population.

<p><b>Is this person:</b> <i>Mark more than one or specify, if applicable.</i><sup>6</sup> White, Chinese, South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, etc.), Black, Filipino, Latin American, Southeast Asian (e.g., Vietnamese, Cambodian, Malaysian, Laotian, etc.), Arab, West Asian (e.g., Iranian, Afghan, etc.), Korean, Japanese Other — Specify.</p>	<p><b>Last week, did this person have definite arrangements to start a new job within the next four weeks?</b> No, Yes</p>	<p><b>Has this person attended a school, college, CEGEP or university at any time since September 2005?</b> <i>Mark as many circles as applicable.</i> Yes, attended elementary, junior high school or high school, Yes, attended trade school, college, CEGEP or other non-university institution, Yes, attended university, No, did not attend school at any time since September 2005.</p>	<p><b>Is this person:</b> <i>Mark more than one or specify, if applicable.</i><sup>7</sup> White Chinese, South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, etc.), Black, Filipino, Latin American, Southeast Asian (e.g., Vietnamese, Cambodian, Malaysian, Laotian, etc.), Arab, West Asian (e.g., Iranian, Afghan, etc.), Korean, Japanese Other — Specify.</p>	<p><b>Where did this person live 1 years ago, that is, on May 16, 2005?</b> <i>Mark one circle only. Note: For those who mark the third circle: Please give the name of the city or town rather than the metropolitan area of which it is a part. Lived at the same address as now, Lived at a different address in the same city, town, village, township, municipality or Indian reserve, Lived in a different city, town, village, township, municipality or Indian reserve in Canada, Specify name of: City, town, village, township, municipality or Indian reserve, Lived outside Canada.</i></p>
	<p><b>Did this person look for paid work during the past four weeks?</b> <i>For example, did this person contact an employment centre, check with employers, place or answer newspaper ads, etc.?</i> <i>Mark one circle only.</i> No, Yes, looked for full-time work, Yes, looked for part-time work (less than 30 hours per week).</p>			<p><b>Where did this person live 5 years ago, that is, on May 16, 2001?</b> <i>Mark one circle only. Note: For those who mark the third circle: Please give the name of the city or town rather than the metropolitan area of which it is a part. Lived at the same address as now, Lived at a different address in the same city, town, village, township, municipality or Indian reserve, Lived in a different city, town, village, township, municipality or Indian reserve in Canada, Specify name of: City, town, village, township, municipality or Indian reserve, Lived outside Canada.</i></p>
	<p><b>Could this person have started a job last week had one been available?</b> <i>Mark one circle only.</i> Yes, could have started a job, No, already had a job, No, because of temporary illness or disability, No, because of personal or family responsibilities, No, going to school, No, other reasons.</p>			

<sup>6</sup> This information is collected to support programs that promote equal opportunity for everyone to share in the social, cultural and economic life of Canada.

<sup>7</sup> This information is collected to support programs that promote equal opportunity for everyone to share in the social, cultural and economic life of Canada.

	<p><b>When did this person last work for pay or in self-employment, even for a few days?</b> <i>Mark one circle only.</i> In 2006, In 2005, Before 2005, Never.</p>			
	<p><b>For whom did this person work?</b> <i>For self-employed persons, enter the name of their business. If the business does not have a name, enter the person's name.</i></p>			
	<p><b>What kind of business, industry or service was this?</b> <i>Please give details. For example: new home construction, primary school, municipal police, wheat farm, shoe store, food wholesale, car parts factory.</i></p>			
	<p><b>What was this person's work or occupation?</b> <i>Please be specific. For example: legal secretary, plumber, fishing guide, wood furniture assembler, secondary school teacher (If in the Armed Forces, give rank).</i></p>			
	<p><b>In this work, what were this person's main activities?</b> <i>Please give details. For example: prepared legal documents, installed residential plumbing, guided fishing parties, made wood furniture products, taught mathematics. *Space for 3 options.</i></p>			
	<p><b>At what address did this person usually work most of the time?</b></p>			
	<p><b>In this job, what language did this person use most often?</b> English, French, Other — Specify</p>			
	<p><b>Did this person use any other languages on a regular basis in this job?</b> No, Yes, English, Yes, French, Yes, Other — Specify</p>			
	<p><b>In how many weeks did this person work in 2005?</b> <i>Please enter the total number of weeks worked for pay or in self-employment at all jobs held in 2005. Include those weeks in which this person: was on vacation or sick leave with pay; worked full time or part time; worked for wages, salary, tips or commission; was self-employed; worked directly towards the operation of a family farm or business without formal pay arrangements.</i></p>			

	Number of weeks__ OR None.			
	<b>During most of those weeks, did this person work full time or part time?</b> <i>Mark one circle only.</i> Full time (30 hours or more per week), Part time (less than 30 hours per week)			
	<b>TOTAL INCOME in 2005 from all sources:</b>			
	<b>Is this dwelling:</b> Owned by you or a member of this household (even if it is still being paid for) OR Rented (even if no cash rent is paid)?			

**Appendix B - Culture Codes of Units of Analysis/Observation**

<b>1971</b>	Mother tongue	Religion	Language spoken at home	Ethnic or cultural group of individual or ancestors	Ability to converse in official language(s)	
<b>1991</b>	Mother tongue	Religion	Language spoken at home	Ethnic or cultural group of ancestors	Ability to converse in official language(s)	Conversational ability in other language(s)
<b>2006</b>	Mother tongue		Language spoken at home	Ethnic or cultural group of individual and ancestors	Ability to converse in official language(s)	Conversational ability in other language(s)

In the 1971, the census questions focused on basic cultural characteristics, and the options that were available to be chosen from were Euro-centered as responses. In 1991 there was an additional focus on languages other than English or French spoken well enough to conduct a conversation, along with what language is most often spoken at home with the option to choose more than one. The 1991 questionnaire did not ask about the ethnic or cultural group of the individual but just the ancestors (unlike 1971, and 2006). However, the options to choose from were much more varied from all over the world than in 1971 and the individual could mark as many as applicable - the 2006 survey did not provide options but examples to guide the reader, and spaces to include four categories. The 2006 asked similar questions as 1991 however there was even more focus on additional languages spoken at home (in addition to the language spoken most often). The 2006 questionnaire also focused on the ethnic/cultural group of the individual in a separate question, which was asked in the present day, and not in the past tense of ancestors.

**Appendix C - Economic Codes of Units of Analysis/Observation**

<b>1971</b>	Ownership (current home, previous home, vacation home)	Employment activity (when, how much)		Type of employment and responsibilities	Income and sources of income	Location of employment		
<b>1991</b>	Ownership of dwelling	Employment activity (when, how much)	Employed or searching	Type of employment and responsibilities	Income and sources of income	Location of employment		
<b>2006</b>	Ownership of dwelling	Employment activity (when, how much)	Employed or searching	Type of employment, title, and main activities	Income and sources of income	Location of employment	Hours of Unpaid work (home, childcare, senior care)	Language

In 1971 the economic focus was on the ownership of properties, whether individuals worked and for how many weeks, if they were self-employed or what industry they were in. While 1991 focused on whether this person was able and searching for work and the effort they put into obtaining work. In 2006, some of the questions focused on how many hours of unpaid work were being done, along with the language that was used in their job, and any other language than English and French.

**Appendix D - Education Codes of Units of Analysis/Observation**

<b>1971</b>	Highest grade or year attended of secondary or elementary	Attended school or university	Years of education since secondary school	Location of school/institution	Type of degree, certificate, diploma (level) obtained	
<b>1991</b>	Highest grade or year attended of secondary or elementary	Number of years completed at university	Years completed other than university, secondary, elementary		Type of degree, certificate, diploma (level) obtained	Field of study
<b>2006</b>	Completed high school	Attended school, college, CEGEP, university		Location of school/institution	Type of degree, certificate, diploma, apprenticeship (level) obtained	Field of study

The 1971 questions were concerned with the highest level of education/level reached but not necessarily completed, along with how much was post-secondary education. Whereas 1991 questions were more detailed in the type of post-secondary education attended, and whether levels were completed. In 2006 the majority of the questions concentrated on the completion of degrees, certificates, diplomas, or apprenticeship rather than what was attended.

**Appendix E - Origins (National and Immigrant) Codes of Units of Analysis/Observation**

	<b>National</b>	<b>Immigrant</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Immigrant</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Immigrant</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Immigrant</b>	<b>Immigrant</b>	<b>Immigrant</b>
<b>1971</b>	Place of birth	Place of birth	Place of Parents' birth	Place of Parents' birth	Citizenship	Citizenship	Ethnic or cultural group of individual <i>or</i> ancestors	Ethnic or cultural group of individual <i>or</i> ancestors	Year/period immigrated	Period of immigration
<b>1991</b>	Place of birth	Place of birth			Citizenship	Citizenship	Ethnic or cultural group of ancestors	Ethnic or cultural group of ancestors	Landed immigrant	Year became landed immigrant
<b>2006</b>	Place of birth	Place of birth	Place of Parents' birth	Place of Parents' birth	Citizenship	Citizenship	Ethnic or cultural group of individual <i>and</i> ancestors	Ethnic or cultural group of individual <i>and</i> ancestors	Landed immigrant	Year became landed immigrant

Both 1971 and 1991, origin options for answers reflected North American and European characteristics for the population while 2006 gave opportunity to give multiple answers as well as provided examples as guidelines rather than answers to choose from.

**Appendix F - Social Codes of Units of Analysis/Observation**

<b>1971</b>	Relationship to head of household	Sex	Marital status	Date of birth	Ability to converse in official language(s)	Mobility (living)	Number of children (for women only)	Military service (for men only)
<b>1991</b>	Relationship to Person 1	Sex	Marital status	Date of birth	Ability to converse in official language(s)	Mobility (living)	Number of children (for women only)	
<b>2006</b>	Relationship to Person 1	Sex	Marital status	Date of birth	Ability to converse in official language(s)	Mobility (living)		Common-law

The 1971, 1991, and 2006 questions are straightforward and appropriately detailed in the charts. The questions posed for all three generation of censuses did not show further interest in anything more than the other and is depicted effectively in the charts.

**Works Cited**

- Africentric Alternative School. Toronto, ON. Retrieved November 29, 2013 from <http://schoolweb.tdsb.on.ca/africentricschool/Home.aspx>.
- Africentric Learning Institute (2012). *About ALI*. Halifax, NS. Retrieved November 29, 2013 from <http://africentric.ca/about-ali/>
- Abrudan, E. (2010). The dynamics of postmodern identity. *Journal of Media Research*, 4(1), 23-32.
- Abu-Laban, Y. (2004). The new North American and the segmentation of Canadian citizenship. *International Journal of Canadian Studies*, 29, 17- 40.
- Abu-Laban, Y., & Dhamoon, R. (2009). Dangerous (internal) foreigners and nation-building: The case of Canada. *International Political Science Review*, 30(2), 163-183.
- Abu-Laban, Y., & Gabriel, C. (2009). *Selling Diversity: Immigration, Multiculturalism, Employment Equity, and Globalization*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press Higher Education.
- Abu-Laban, Y., & Nieguth, T. (2000). Reconsidering the constitution, minorities and politics in Canada 1. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 33(3), 465-497.
- Ali, M. A. (2008). Second-generation youth's belief in the myth of Canadian multiculturalism. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 40(2), 89-107).
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities*. New York, NY: Verso.
- Austin, D. (2010). Narratives of power: Historical mythologies in contemporary Quebec and Canada. *Race and Class*, 55(1), 19-32.
- Babbie, E. (2004). *The Practice of Social Research* (10th ed.). Toronto, ON: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Balthazar, L. (1995). Quebec and the ideal of federalism. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 538, 40-53.
- Bannerji, H. (2000). *The Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc.
- Banting K., & Soroka, S. (2012). Minority nationalism and immigrant integration in Canada. *Nations and Nationalism*, 18(1), 156-176.

- Bélanger, A., Malenfant, É. C., Martel, L., Carrière, Y., Hicks, C. & Rowe, G. (2005). *Population Projections of Visible Minority Groups, Canada, Provinces and Regions (2001-2017)*. Statistics Canada Demography Division.
- Benessaieh, A. (2010). Multiculturalism, interculturality, transculturality. In Benessaieh, A. (Ed.). *Transcultural Americas* (11-30). Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa Press.
- Benessaieh, A. (2012). *Transcultural Politics as Deep Multiculturalism: Canada in Global Perspective*. Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/1750321/Transcultural\\_Politics](https://www.academia.edu/1750321/Transcultural_Politics).
- Bhabha, H. K. (1990a). Interview with Homi K. Bhabha. In Rutherford, J. (Ed.). *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference* (207-221). London, UK: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1990b). Introduction: narrating the nation. In Bhabha, H. K. (Ed.). *Nation and Narration* (1-7). London, UK: Routledge.
- Bhargava, H. (2002). The multicultural framework. In Deb, K. (Ed.). *Mapping Multiculturalism* (77-105). Daryagani, New Delhi: Rawat Publications.
- Boekestijn, C. (1988). Intercultural migration and the development of personal identity: The dilemma between identity maintenance and cultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 12, 83-105.
- Blad, C., & Couton, P. (2009). The rise of an intercultural nation: Immigration, diversity and nationhood in Quebec. *Journal of Ethnic Migration Studies*, 35(4), 645-667.
- Bloemraad, I., Korteweg, A., & Yurdakul, G. (2008). Citizenship and immigration: Multiculturalism, assimilation, and challenges to the nation-state. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34, 153-179.
- Bouchard, G. & Charles, T. (2008). *Building the future: a time for reconciliation. Québec: abridged report*. Gouvernement de Québec.
- Bouma, G. D. (2000). *The Research Process: Fourth Edition*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Canadian Multiculturalism Act (2013). Government of Canada. Published by the Minister of Justice at: <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca>.
- Chambers, S. (1998). Contract or conversation? Theoretical lessons from the Canadian constitutional crisis. *Politics and Society*, 26(1), 143-172.
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2012a). Canadian multiculturalism. *Government of Canada*. Retrieved December 11, 2012, from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/English/multiculturalism/multi.asp>.

- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2012b). Canadian multiculturalism: an inclusive citizenship. *Government of Canada*. Retrieved December 11, 2012, from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/multiculturalism/citizenship.asp>.
- Conrick M., & Donovan, P. (2010). Immigration and language policy and planning in Québec and Canada: Language learning and integration. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 31(4), 331-345.
- Cornwell, G. H., & Stoddard, E. W. (2001). Introduction: National boundaries/transnational identities. In Cornwell, G. H., & Stoddard, E. W. (Eds.). *Global Multiculturalism: Comparative Perspectives on Ethnicity, Race, and Nation* (1 -26). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc. \*
- Deb, K. (2002). Introduction. In Deb, K. (Ed.). *Mapping Multiculturalism* (13-76). Daryagani, New Delhi: Rawat Publications.
- Duncan, H. (2003). The public policy role of citizenship in a globalized world. *Canadian Diversity*, 2(1), pp. 79-80.
- Edmonston, B., & Lee, S. M. (2010). "Canadian" as national ethnic origin: Trends and implications. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 41(3), 77-108.
- Ferguson, B., Langlois, S., & Roberts, L.W. (2009). Social cohesion in Canada. *The Tocqueville Review/La revue Tocqueville*, 30(2), 69-101.
- Fleras, A. (2009). *The Politics of Multiculturalism: Multicultural Governance in Comparative Perspective*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fillion, R. (2008). *Multicultural Dynamics and the Ends of History: Exploring Kant, Hegel, and Marx*. Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa Press.
- Garcea, J. (2008). Postulations on the fragmentary effects of multiculturalism in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 40(1), 141-160.
- Garcea, J., Kirova, A. & Wong, L. (2008). Introduction: Multiculturalism discourses in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 40(1), 1-10.
- Ghosh, R. (2004). Public education and multicultural policy in Canada: The special case of Quebec. *International Review of Education*, 50(5-6), 543-566.
- Gutmann, A. (1994). Introduction. In Gutmann, A. (Ed.). *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition* (3-24). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Haddock, B. & Sutch, P. (2003). Introduction. In Haddock, B. & Sutch, P. (Eds.). *Multiculturalism, Identity and Rights* (1-9). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Hall, S. (1986). On postmodernism and articulation: An interview with Stuart Hall. In Grossberg, L. (Ed.). *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 10, 45-60.
- Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In Rutherford, J. (Ed.). *Identity Community, Culture, Difference* (222-237). London, UK: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hall, S. (1992). New ethnicities. In Donald, J., & Rattansi, A. (Eds.). *'Race', Culture, and Difference* (pp. 252-259). London, UK: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1996). The questions of cultural identity. In S. Hall et al. (Eds.). *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies* (596-634). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Hall, S. (1997). *Race, the Floating Signifier: Featuring Stuart Hall*. Media Education Foundation. Transcript.
- Harris, H.W. (1995). Introduction: A conceptual overview of race, ethnicity, and identity. In Harris, H. W., Blue, H. C. & Griffith E.E.H. (Eds.). *Racial and Ethnic Identity: Psychological Development and Creative Expression* (1-14). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hiebert, D. (2005). Migration and the demographic transformation of Canadian cities: The social geography of Canada's major metropolitan centres in 2017. *Serving Canada's Multicultural Population for the Future: Policy Forum*. March 22-23, 2005. Discussion Papers, pp. 30-40.
- House of Commons Canada (1971), Oct. 8. Debates. Ottawa: House of Commons Canada.
- Ibrahim, V. (2011). Ethnicity. In Caliendo S. M., & McIlwain (Eds.). *Race and Ethnicity* (12-20). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ignatieff, M. (1994). *Blood ad Belonging: Journeys into the New Nationalism*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Ireland, S. & Proulx P.J. (2009). Negotiating new identities in Québec's écriture migrante. *Contemporary French and Francophone Studies*, 13(1), 35-43.
- James, C. E. (2007). Negotiating school: Marginalized students' participation in their education process. In Fuji Johnson, G., & Enomoto, R. (Eds.). *Race, Racialization, and Antiracism in Canada and Beyond* (17-36). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Jiwani, Y. (2006). *Discourse of denial: Mediations of race, gender and violence*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Karim, H. K. (2008). Press, public sphere, and pluralism: Multiculturalism debates in Canadian English-language newspapers. *Canadian Ethics Journal*, 40(1), 57-78.

- Karim, H. K. (2009). Pundits, pachyderms, and pluralism: The never-ending debate on multiculturalism. *Canadian Journal of Communication Corporation*, 34(4), 701-710.
- Kenny, M. (2004). *The Politics of Identity: Liberal Political Theory and the Dilemmas of Difference*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Kobayashi, A. & Johnson, G. F. (2007). Introduction. In Fuji Johnson, G., & Enomoto, R. (Eds.). *Race, Racialization, and Antiracism in Canada and Beyond* (3-16). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Kraidy, U.T. (2002). Sunny days of Sesame Street? Multiculturalism and resistance postmodernism. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 26(1), 9-25.
- Kymlicka, W. (1996). *Multicultural Citizenship*. DOI: 10.1093/0198290918.001.0001. Oxford Scholarship.
- Kymlicka, W. (2007). Multicultural odysseys. *Ethnopolitics*, 6(4), 585-597.
- Kymlicka, W. (2010). *The Current State of Multiculturalism in Canada and Research Themes on Canadian Multiculturalism 2008-2010*. Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- Kymlicka, W. (2011). Multiculturalism in normative theory and in social science. *Ethnicities*, 11(1), 5-11.
- Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (1994). Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. *Ethics*, 104(2), 352-381.
- Laczko, L. S. (1995). *Pluralism and Inequality in Quebec* (14-39). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press Inc.
- Lightman, N., & Good, G. L. (2012). The intersecting dynamics of social exclusion: Age, gender, race, and immigrant status in Canada's labour market. *Canadian Ethnic Studies Association*, 44(3), 121-145.
- Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Theory and History of Literature, V.10 (3-27). Translated by Bennington, G., Massumi, B. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Maalouf, A. (2003). *In the Name of Identity: Violence and the Need to Belong*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Mahrouse, G. (2010). 'Reasonable accommodation' in Québec: The limits of participation and dialogue. *Race and Class*, 52(1), 85-96.
- McKenna, B. (2004). Critical discourse studies: Where to from here? *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1(1), 9-39.

- McLellan, J., Richmond, A. I., (1994). Multiculturalism in crisis: A postmodern perspective on Canada. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 17(4), 662-681.
- Milne, D. (1991). *The Canadian constitution*. Toronto, ON: James Lorimer & Company, Publishers.
- Ministry of Immigration and Cultural Communities (1981). *Autant de façons d'être Québécois: plan d'action du gouvernement du Québec à l'intention des communautés culturelles*. Gouvernement du Québec.
- Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada. (1990). *The Canadian Multiculturalism Act: A guide for Canadians*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Supply & Services.
- Nakayama K., & Martin, J. N. (1999). Introduction: whiteness as the communication of social identity. In Nakayama, K., & Martin, J. N. (Eds.). *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity* (pp. vii-xiv). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Neuman, L. W., Robson, K. (2012). *Basics of Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (2nd Canadian ed.). Toronto, ON: Pearson Canada Inc.
- Parekh, B. (2006). *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Radhakrishnan, R. (1995). Postmodernism and the rest of the world. *Organization* 1(2), 305-340.
- Randall, M. (2008). Writing home: A territorial history of French Canadian literature. *Review: Literature and Arts of the Americas*, 41(1), 20-30.
- Salée, D. (2007). The Quebec state and the management of ethnocultural diversity: Perspectives on an Ambiguous Record. In Banting, K. Courchene T. J. & Seidle, L. F. (Eds.). *The Art of the State III: Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship* (105-142). Montréal, QC: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Schachter, E. P. (2005). Context and identity formation: A theoretical analysis and a case study. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 20(3), 375-395.
- Seljak, D. (2003). Values: The hidden curriculum in education. *Canadian Diversity*, 2(1), 64-66.
- Spivak, G. C. (1990). Questions of Multiculturalism. In Harasym, S. (Ed.). *The post-colonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues* (59 – 66). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Statistics Canada (2012, December 12). Overview of the census of population: general information. *Government of Canada*. Retrieved November 2, 2012, from

<http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/ref/overview-aperçu/pop1-eng.cfm>.

- Turner, B. S. (2006). Citizenship and the crisis of multiculturalism. *Citizenship Studies*, 10(5), 607-618.
- Taylor, C. (2001). Multiculturalism and political identity. *Ethnicities*, 1(1), 122-128.
- Taylor, C. (2012). Interculturalism or multiculturalism? *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 38(4-5), 413-423.
- Taylor, L., James, C. E., & Saul, R. (2007). Who belongs? Exploring race and racialization in Canada. In Fuji Johnson, G., & Enomoto, R. (Eds.). *Race, Racialization, and Antiracism in Canada and Beyond* (151-178). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Thiel, M., & Coate, R. (2010). Preface. In Coate, R., & Thiel, M. (Eds.). *Identity Politics in the Age of Globalization* (vii- ix). Boulder, CO: First Forum Press.
- Trotman, J. (2002). Introduction. In Trotman, J. (Ed.). *Multiculturalism: Roots and Realities* (ix-xvii). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Turner, B. S. (2006). Citizenship and the crisis of multiculturalism. *Citizenship Studies*, 10(5), 607-618.
- Winter, E. (2011). 'Immigrants don't ask for self-government': How multiculturalism is (de)legitimized in multinational societies. *Ethnopolitics*, 10(2), 187-204.
- Yalden, M. (2011). Multiculturalism – an anniversary celebration. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 43(1-2), 5-15.

### Endnotes

---

<sup>i</sup> A diversity management policy for this study is a formal policy that emerged to address and manage a population with diverse characteristics such as cultural, ethnic and national traits as a result of émigrés inhabitants. For Canada, the two diversity management policies in question are Canadian multiculturalism, and Quebec interculturalism.

<sup>ii</sup> Jean-François Lyotard is a prominent scholar of postmodernism and is one of the first philosophers who pioneered postmodernism as a condition.

<sup>iii</sup> Meta-narratives can be considered the cumulative narratives that create the overarching description in this case of a nation, or nation-state.

<sup>iv</sup> Homi K. Bhabha (1990a) describes culture as a third space of consciousness in the process of identification. The cultural hybridity paradigm contends that no true culture can authentically exist and every culture is an intermingling of diverse experiences to which each person creates their individual culture based on their cognition.

<sup>v</sup> Human agency regarding the formation of identity refers to the subjectivity and reflexive process of self-identification to produce individual meaning for identity, while identity fluidity refers to the ongoing process of identification, contrary to fixed, static, unchangeable characteristics imposed by external figures.

<sup>vi</sup> The Census is the primary tool for the government to track demographic and related social changes in Canada and is the main source of the collection of ethnic data (Lee and Edmonston, 2010, p. 78). Every five years, it is presented households to gather information on the Canadian population.

<sup>vii</sup> Statistics Canada is a department in the federal government of Canada that creates and distributes the Canadian Census.

<sup>viii</sup> *“While most people of Canada view themselves as Canadian, information about their ancestral origins has been collected since the 1901 Census to reflect the changing composition of the Canadian population and is needed to ensure that everyone, regardless of his/her ethnic or cultural background, has **equal opportunity** to share fully in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada. Therefore, this question refers to the origins of this person’s **ancestors**”* - taken from the Census of Canada Questionnaire, 1991). *“This information is collected to support programs that promote equal opportunity for everyone to share in the social, cultural and economic life of Canada”* – taken from the Census of Canada Questionnaire, 2006).

<sup>ix</sup> See **Appendix A** for a breakdown of the questions by markers.

<sup>x</sup> See **Appendices B through F** for the codes that provide a description of the markers as units of analysis.

<sup>xi</sup> Both 1976 and 2011 questionnaires were short form and not available in the long form. The long form questionnaires covered significantly more details.

<sup>xii</sup> Identity for this research emphasises human agency and identification as manifested through experiences. National and cultural identity in which a person ascribes thus emanates from a person’s subjective consciousness to which identity is constructed based on a person’s surroundings, and not inherent or fixed cultural characteristics.

<sup>xiii</sup> Maxwell Yalden served as the former commissioner of official languages from 1977 until 1984.

<sup>xiv</sup> The name of Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada has been changed and is currently called Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

---

<sup>xv</sup> As previously mentioned in the chapter, Maalouf (2003) deems reciprocity, among recognition and respect, as a requirement for equal coexistence of identities in a country with multiple backgrounds (p. 42).

<sup>xvi</sup> A contemporary example of conflicting ideologies from dominant and minority culture and ethnicities can be reflected in Quebec's current debate of adopting a Charter of Values, which prohibits the display of religious symbols in public. At the surface of the debate are more visible items such as variations of headscarves, or turbans, which are typically worn by and can signify individuals of different ethnic origin. Furthermore, the discussion of Quebec's Charter of Values can arguably be an extension of the fundamentals of the Reasonable Accommodation Debate, which will be discussed in chapter two.

<sup>xvii</sup> In the case of Canada, its population is historically divided and fragmented, which can lead to confusion as newcomers attempt to make sense of the cultural expectations. In this case Quebec and Canada's competing nation-building agendas complicate the process for immigrants and belonging (Banting and Soroka, 2012, p. 158).

<sup>xviii</sup> A Canadian decentralized federation emerged over a legislative union, which positioned provinces with slight power (Balthazar, 1995, p. 41).

<sup>xix</sup> As discussed in chapter two, Trudeau was the Prime Minister behind the growth and informal implementation of Canada's governing policy of multiculturalism before the Canadian Multiculturalism Act was passed in 1988 under Brian Mulroney (Ferguson, Langlois & Roberts, 2009, p. 85).

<sup>xx</sup> Multiculturalism as a policy was created as inclusive for all ethnic and cultural identities in Canada, which did not support Quebec's ideologies of biculturalism and duality.

<sup>xxi</sup> In 1964, the Canadian constitution did not provide Quebec the flexibility, freedom and power to build and protect their identity in the future and thus the Quebec government did not support it (Chambers, 1988, p. 147).

<sup>xxii</sup> The ongoing debate of the resistance shown by Quebec residents, who do not wish to adopt the Quebec Charter of Values, can be viewed as in turn resisting Quebec cultural ideals. Speaking the French language as a requisite to immigrating was inadequate in creating a group of citizens who would more likely and more easily "integrate" into, and accept Quebec cultural ideals.

<sup>xxiii</sup> Under the Parti Québécois leadership, within the framework of Canada's points-based system, Quebec would award additional points to immigrants who were French-speaking and were more suitable and perceived compatible with Quebec society (Mahrouse, 2010, p. 86).

<sup>xxiv</sup> It could be argued that Quebec's cultural history has had an impact on today's public policy in Quebec; for example, the Quebec government's current attempt to include a secular Charter of Values to attempt to control the amount of non-Quebec cultural characteristics visible in Quebec society, specifically for émigrés and visible religious expressions - to maintain Quebec's distinct culture.

<sup>xxv</sup> Migrant writings are works from marginalized, migrant population, as an outlet of expression countering dominant and mainstream discourses, and a voice for the marginalized population.

<sup>xxvi</sup> Although it is difficult to clearly connect the lineage for the origins of the migrant writings, they were present since the 1940's (before the Quiet Revolution of the 1960's) as Quebec experienced major influxes of immigration from various countries approximately a decade before (Ireland & Proulx, 2009, p. 36).

---

<sup>xxvii</sup> Understandably, Quebec has more to lose from the diversification of their cultural population as a large struggling minority within Canada, though the Bouchard-Taylor commission concluded that Quebec's identity is presently not in a critical state.

<sup>xxviii</sup> Multiculturalism and interculturalism as Janus Faced policies raises questions of whether there are fundamental differences between multiculturalism and interculturalism, and whether both policies achieve different outcomes (other than language acquisition) in relation to émigrés identity rights and equality within cultural discourse in Canada.

<sup>xxix</sup> Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2012b) outlines Canadian citizenship through their online document titled *Canadian Multiculturalism: An Inclusive Citizenship*: "All Canadians are guaranteed equality before the law and equality of opportunity regardless of their origins. Canada's laws and policies recognize Canada's diversity by race, cultural heritage, ethnicity, religion, ancestry and place of origin and guarantee to all men and women complete freedom of conscience, of thought, belief, opinion expression, association and peaceful assembly. All of these rights, our freedom and our dignity, are guaranteed through our Canadian citizenship, our Canadian Constitution, and our Charter of Rights and Freedoms" (para. 5).

<sup>xxx</sup> As indicated in chapter one, the census of Canada is conducted every five years and asks each household to account for its members, to gather statistics and learn about the population's characteristics.

"The Census is Canada's largest and most comprehensive data source". It is the most comprehensive tool used to enumerate characteristics within the Canadian population, collecting data on demographic and linguistic information on every one living in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2012, para. 1). The questionnaires are available to be filled out in English and French exclusively.

<sup>xxxi</sup> Immigrants are more likely to earn less, fill more precarious jobs, and experience higher unemployment rates than Canadian-born workers (Lightman & Gingrich, 2012, p. 125). And according to a study, in 2009, visible minorities had 40% greater odds of non-permanent employment than those who were non-visible minorities (Lightman & Gingrich, 2012, p. 133).

<sup>xxxii</sup> Collège d'enseignement général et professionnel (CEGEP) refers to post-secondary education institution exclusive to the Province of Quebec.

<sup>xxxiii</sup> "Canada, by naturalization" refers to the process by which an immigrant is granted citizenship of Canada, under the Citizenship Act.

<sup>xxxiv</sup> The differentiating notion of "us" and "them" does originate from the work of Edward Said from his conceptualization of "othering", specifically is his book titled *Orientalism*.

<sup>xxxv</sup> Visible minorities have 60% greater odds of being below the Low Income Measure (LIM) than non-visible minorities (Lightman & Gingrich, 2012, p. 132). "*Statistics Canada calculates the Low Income Measure (LIM) as a dollar threshold that delineates low-income in relation to the median income.*" (Lightman & Gingrich, 2012, p. 140).

<sup>xxxvi</sup> Different schools systems have indeed emerged in parts of Canada as alternative to White Eurocentric schools, which demonstrates development in the institutionalization of education by providing an alternative school outside of normative education systems. This includes the *Africentric Alternative School* situated in west Toronto, which integrates "the diverse perspectives, experiences and histories of people of African descent into the provincial mandated curriculum" (Africentric Alternative School). As well as the *Africentric Learning Institute* in Halifax, which "proposes to be a first class institute dedicated to

---

excellence in Africentric educational research and practice” (Africentric Learning Institute 2012).