

INDEXING INTEGRATION

2nd Edition

A Review of National
and International Models

JACK JEDWAB Canadian Institute for Identities and Migration
STUART SOROKA Center for Political Studies, University of Michigan





INDEXING INTEGRATION

A Review of National and International Models

Jack Jedwab, Association for Canadian Studies
Stuart Soroka, Political Science, McGill University



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	1
Introduction	2
Selecting the Indices	3
The Experts	6
Methodology	7
Key Findings	8
Discussion and the Way Forward	14
Appendix A: Expert Scorecard	17
Appendix B: Detailed Ratings	18
Appendix C: Detailed Comments from the Experts	22
References	39

PREFACE

The Canadian Institute for Identities and Migration (CIIM), a division of the Association for Canadian Studies, is an independent, non-partisan, non-profit think tank dedicated to the study of population movement and evolving identities in Canada and abroad. CIIM produces and disseminates original research in addition to generating relevant conferences and publications.

This publication, initially released in 2014 and funded by Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC), reviews international and national models of indexing integration and observes that it is extremely challenging to effectively assess immigrant integration within a single framework. Accordingly we have concluded that a multi-dimensional, mixed-method index is needed. Such an index should employ a wide range of quantitative data combined with selected qualitative measures in order to capture the context and key conditions contributing to immigrant integration.

Since then, the CIIM has launched a new initiative funded by IRCC entitled the Canadian Index for Measuring Integration (CIMI). The CIMI integrates a number of data sources in order to gauge the success of newcomer integration in Canada. Through the creation of an agreed upon set of benchmarks and socio-economic indicators, the CIMI delivers an ongoing, regularized measurement tool to help identify policy and civil society responses that are empirically supported and evidenced-based.

As a first of its kind in Canada, the CIMI can be used to determine how effectively the country is integrating its immigrants and what impact this process has on different areas of Canadian society. Multiple factors are identified so as to uncover what underlies successful integration as well as the economic and social inclusion of minorities. The CIMI in turn addresses the significant gap that has existed in our understanding and measurement of the effectiveness of immigrant integration in Canada.

This second edition of *Indexing Integration: A Review of National and International Models* aims to increase the applicability of this publication to a broader audience, one that aligns itself with the users of CIMI.

Jack Jedwab
President of the Canadian Institute for Identities and Migration
and the Association for Canadian Studies

INTRODUCTION

Canada's demographic profile continues to undergo massive change. Undoubtedly, ethnic, racial and linguistic diversity have always been a central part of the Canadian social landscape. But economic and social globalization, coupled with immigration policies that target population growth, has resulted in an increasingly diverse Canada. Fundamental to ensuring immigrants' transition to Canada is as seamless as possible is the concept of immigrant integration.

Immigrant integration is visualized as a "two-way street", where there is a metaphorical meeting of the immigrant and the receiving population somewhere in the middle of the street. The integration process targets the attainment of relative parity with the broader population in key areas (i.e., economic, social, health, and civic and democratic participation). This also presumes that the receiving population will make adjustments to facilitate the process of integration.

Immigrant integration and the accommodation of diversity have been important policy objectives in Canada and in several countries around the globe. However, the process of implementing integration frameworks is often faced by multiple challenges, which can in some ways be better understood by the assessment of immigrant performance. An index has the ability to do this by providing a composite measure to evaluate the relative performance of immigrants compared to their receiving society. Accordingly, it can provide data and evidence to demonstrate the success of immigrant integration across indicators of relevance. This publication aims to review existing measures of immigrant integration, with a view towards the construction of a unique Canadian index.

How well has Canada accomplished its goals in the area of immigration and integration?

Answering this question requires some consensus around societal goals and policy objectives, both of which are the object of ongoing discussion. This publication examines several different measures that are currently used in immigrant receiving societies, with a shared focus on the nature and degree of immigrant integration into society and the wider societal effects of such integration.

That which follows will evaluate the relative merits of various approaches and measures to establish an index on immigrant integration. Summaries of selected indices are accompanied by expert reviews and culminate in recommendations and conclusions regarding the development of an integration index in the Canadian context. This evaluation constitutes an essential preliminary step in plotting a framework that monitors changing integration outcomes over a selected period of time across territories or within a defined territory.

Our approach to this evaluation consisted of the following stages:

Stage 1: Identify existing indices that are most relevant to our objectives

Stage 2: Select experts in both immigration and quantitative methods

Stage 3: Produce a scorecard which captures the most relevant information for each index

Stage 4: Commission reviews on the indices from our experts

We further outline the details of each of these stages below. We then review the results, both quantitative and qualitative, and make recommendations regarding the development of measures that we feel may be most useful in the Canadian context.

SELECTING THE INDICES

Our selection of indices is based on several considerations. We are interested in employing some of the more commonly-used indices in the area of immigration, diversity, and integration. We also want to use indices that identify and measure a broad spectrum of variables related to immigration and diversity. Some indices focus on demographic and social indicators, while others concentrate on policy and attitudes. Our aim has been to include pertinent examples of each.

Our own review of the field, alongside discussions with subject-area experts, has resulted in the selection of the following six indices¹:

1. IWA: Integration and “Welcome-ability” Indexes (Ravanera et al.)

These indices were developed by Zenaida Ravanera, Victoria Esses and Fernando Rajulton at Western University.

The Integration Index measures the economic, social, and political integration of individuals. It takes into account the multi-dimensionality of integration, particularly economic inclusion and parity, social recognition and belonging, political involvement that insures the legitimacy of institutions, and civic participation. The Integration Index relies on data from the 2008 Canadian General Social Survey on Social Networks.

¹ Descriptions are drawn in part from project websites and reports.

The Welcome-ability Index measures the capacities of communities to welcome and integrate newcomers. It is a community-level measure and takes into account opportunities and facilities including employment opportunities, healthcare facilities and positive attitudes towards immigrants. The welcome-ability index relies on data that collated baseline information on Ontario communities served by local partnerships that were specifically tasked with enhancing the capacities of communities to welcome newcomers. These data were gathered from the 2006 Canadian Census, 2008 Canadian Community Health Survey, Ontario 2011 (a service provider database), and City Plans and Policies.

For more information, visit <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/plc/vol1/iss1/6>

2. HLI: OECD's How's Life? Index

The How's Life? Index, developed by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), is intended to allow you “to compare well-being across countries, based on 11 topics the OECD has identified as essential, in the areas of material living conditions and quality of life.”

The index focuses on 11 topics that reflect what the OECD has identified as essential to well-being in terms of material living conditions (housing, income, jobs) and quality of life (community, education, environment, governance, health, life satisfaction, safety and work-life balance). Each topic is built on one to four specific indicators. For example, the Jobs topic is based on four separate measures: the employment rate, personal earnings, the long-term unemployment rate and job security. For each indicator, it is possible to compare results for men vs. women and immigrants vs. native-born.

For more information, visit www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org

3. MIPEX: Migrant Integration Policy Index

The Migrant Integration Policy Index is a long-term project that evaluates and compares what governments are doing to promote the integration of migrants in all EU Member States and 4 non-EU countries. MIPEX covers seven policy areas which shape a migrant's journey to full citizenship: labour market access,

family reunification, long-term residence, political participation, access to nationality, anti-discrimination, and education. Some 148 policy indicators have been developed to create a rich, multi-dimensional picture of migrants' opportunities to participate in society.

For more information, visit www.mipex.eu

4. CIIS: California Immigrant Integration Scorecard

The California Immigrant Integration Scorecard was developed by Manuel Pastor, Rhonda Ortiz, Vanessa Carter, Justin Scoggins, and Anthony Perez at the Center for the Study of Immigrant Integration at the University of Southern California.

The Scorecard measures immigrant integration and progress across ten California regions: Santa Clara, East Bay, San Diego, Sacramento, Orange, San Francisco, Inland Empire, Los Angeles, San Joaquin and Fresno. It highlights promising regional and statewide strategies for improving immigrant integration. The authors feel that measures of immigrant integration much acknowledge such variations in area by going beyond more uniform policies and focusing on how immigrants are being incorporated within regions.

For more information, visit <http://dornsife.usc.edu/csii/scorecard>

5. MIIA: Manhattan Institute's Immigrant Assimilation study

“Measuring Immigrant Assimilation in Post-Recession America” was produced by Jacob L. Vigdor, an Adjunct Fellow at the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research. The report uses the Assimilation Index, a summary measure of the degree of similarity or difference between the foreign- and native-born populations in the United States. The assimilation index is computed using three sets of factors: economic (including employment and education indicators), cultural (including English language ability and intermarriage), and civic (including citizenship and military service). The report provides information on a composite index incorporating all three sets of factors and component indices examining each set.

For more information, visit www.manhattan-institute.org/pdf/cr_76.pdf

6. MCP: Multiculturalism Policy Index (Banting and Kymlicka)

The Multiculturalism Policy Index is a scholarly research project led by Keith Banting and Will Kymlicka at Queen's University that monitors the evolution of multiculturalism policies across Western democracies. The project is designed to provide information about multiculturalism policies in a standardized format that aids comparative research and contributes to the understanding of state-minority relations. There are three separate indices looking at three groups of minorities: one index relating to immigrant groups, one relating to historic national minorities, and one relating to indigenous peoples.

For more information, visit www.queensu.ca/mcp/home

THE EXPERTS

Five experts working in the field of immigration and integration in Canada have been commissioned to review and comment on the six selected indices. The five experts are briefly introduced in this section.

Antoine Bilodeau is Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at Concordia University in Montreal. His research interests focus on the political integration of immigrants and the dynamics of public opinion toward ethnic diversity and immigration. His research has been published in many journals in political science and ethnic studies such as the *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, the *International Migration Review*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, the *International Political Science Review*, *Democratization*, the *Canadian Journal of Political Science* and the *Australian Journal of Political Science*. Antoine is a member of the steering committee for the Centre for the Study of Democratic Citizenship and is an affiliate with the Canadian Network for Research on Terrorism, Security and Society.

Donna Dasko is Senior Vice President of Environics Research Group Limited. She is one of Canada's best-known analysts of public opinion and is a frequent commentator in the media on current political events. She is active in the community as a current or former director of a number of organizations including the Canadian Unity Council, St. Stephen's Community House, the United Way of Greater Toronto and the Canadian Youth Foundation. Donna was born and raised in Winnipeg. She holds a Ph.D. and an M.A. from the University of Toronto and a B.A. (Honours) from the University of Manitoba. In 2003, she was recognized as a distinguished graduate of the University of Manitoba. Donna is also Past National Chair of Equal Voice, a national, bilingual, multi-partisan organization dedicated to electing more women to all levels of political office in Canada.

Allison Harell is a specialist in political behavior and public opinion in industrialized democracies. In particular, she is interested in the implications of ethnocultural diversity and gender for citizenship. She is the principal investigator of the Race, Gender and the Welfare State survey, a cross-national study of attitudes toward redistribution. Allison is also a co-investigator of the Canadian Youth Study and a member of Canadian Election Study team. Her research combines traditional survey techniques with experiments in order to capture the ways in which gendered and racial cues influence attitudes. She is the founding co-director of the Political Communication and Public Opinion Laboratory at the University of Québec at Montréal (UQAM).

Vic Satzewich is Professor of Sociology at McMaster University. He was a Commonwealth Scholar at the University of Glasgow, where he earned his Ph.D. in 1988. He has published over 50 articles and chapters in books dealing with various aspects of immigration, ethnicity, Aboriginal-non-Aboriginal relations, and racism. His books include *Racism and the Incorporation of Foreign*

Labour, Farm Labour Migration to Canada Since 1945, The Ukrainian Diaspora, Transnational Identities and Practices in Canada (edited with Lloyd Wong), and *Race and Ethnicity in Canada: A Critical Introduction* (with Nikolaos Liodakis).

Lloyd Wong is Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Calgary. His research interests include transnationalism and citizenship, immigrant integration, and multiculturalism. In 2013 his article (with A. Tezli) entitled *Measuring Social, Cultural, and Civic Integration in Canada* was published in the journal *Canadian Ethnic Studies*. In 2006 he co-edited a book (with Vic Satzewich) entitled *Transnational Identities and Practices in Canada*. Other recent journal articles appear in *Journal of Chinese Overseas*, *Journal of Social Research*, *International Journal and International Migration*. Book chapters have appeared in *Race and Racism in 21st Century Canada* (S. Heir and S. Bolaria eds.), *Mobilities, Knowledge and Social Justice* (S. Ilcan ed.), and *Street Protests and Fantasy Parks: Globalization, Culture and the State* (J. Stein and D. Cameron eds.).

METHODOLOGY

In order to evaluate the selected indices, five experts have provided their impressions of how well each index captures immigrant integration in its measures and approach. To accomplish this, a scorecard had been provided to each expert. The scorecard has three sections, the first two capturing the quantitative measures of each index on a range of different dimensions and the last section allowing for additional qualitative commentary. For the more precise details of the scorecard, see Appendix A.

How do you effectively design a scorecard?

The design of the scorecard is of some significance. The simple quantitative ratings provide easily accessible and comparable information on the six indices and their qualitative assessments allow the experts to add comments that may not fit into the first two sections of the scorecard.

The model for the scorecard required careful consideration of what we want to capture in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of each of the indices and their most important dimensions. Two aspects in particular are of most value to us, the first being the content of the indices. Our scorecard is able to capture the measures used for each index, looking specifically at the a) economic, b) social and c) political dimensions of integration. Secondly, the long-term usability and applicability of each index has been evaluated based on ratings that focus on a) the availability of measures over time and geographies, b) the ease with which the indices could be understood, and c) the potential for policy decisions.

See Appendix B and C for the results of the scorecards. Appendix B entails the experts' ratings of the six specific topics related to the content and usability/applicability of each index. Appendix C provides the qualitative assessments and commentaries of each expert.

Below, we rely on these data, alongside our own assessments of existing indices, to provide an analysis of the potential for indexing integration in Canada. We begin by reviewing each of the six topics one by one.

KEY FINDINGS

In this section, we offer summary figures averaged across respondents. We discuss results by topic and offer our own judgments along the way as they relate the development of a Canadian immigrant integration index. As mentioned above, a detailed discussion of the indices from each expert is included in Appendix C.

Index Acronyms:

IWA - Integration and "Welcome-ability" Indexes; **HLI** - How's Life? Index; **MIPEX** - Migrant Integration Policy Index; **CIIS** - California Immigrant Integration Scorecard; **MIA** - Manhattan Institute's Immigrant Assimilation Study; **MCP** - Multiculturalism Policy Index

The Economic Integration of Immigrants

Index	Rating
CIIS	9.6
MIA	8.2
HLI	8.0
MIPEX	8.0
IWA	5.8
MCP	1.5

The experts' rankings of the six indices in terms of the measurement of immigrant integration are listed here. The CIIS scores best in this regard. We discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the various indexes below.

The two indices that best capture economic integration are the MIA and the CIIS. The MIA looks at economic outcomes using six measures based on publicly available census data: 1) earned

income, 2) labour force participation, 3) unemployment, 4) occupation (quantitative rankings by average income in that occupation), 5) educational attainment, and 6) home ownership. Comparison to the local population is built into the index, which is an interesting and important characteristic. The CIIS goes somewhat further: our experts feel that it offers the best assessment of economic integration, combining two dimensions that cover both what they call a ‘snapshot’ and a ‘trajectory’ of economic integration. Our experts are impressed with the focus on both short and long-term economic outcomes and we share their enthusiasm.

The IWA includes two separate indices – an integration index (measured at the individual level) and a welcome-ability index (measured at the aggregate level). The Integration Index is composed of two economic indicators, that is work at a paid job and personal income. These are valuable indicators, but are not as broad a set as used in other indices. The Welcome-ability Index considers household income, low income ratio among immigrants, and the percentage of immigrants renting homes. Our experts note that these indicators may not capture ‘welcome-ability,’ feeling the three measures are only tangentially related to the theoretical models that are supposed to guide the design of the index. That said, the indicators do capture aggregate economic integration outcomes. Given our interest here in economic integration, these three measures are clearly beneficial in measuring immigrant integration.

The HLI does not have immigrant integration as its major concern, but it nevertheless includes certain relevant indicators: housing cost, household net assets, job security, personal earnings, employment rate, long-term unemployment rate, and education. Several of our experts note that although the objective of the HLI is not to assess integration, this list of indicators offers some useful measures.

There is no direct measure of poverty and there may be too much of a focus on housing, but overall this list may provide a relatively good start to measure a combination of 1) housing, 2) income, and 3) jobs.

MIPEX offers the most comprehensive set of economic indicators. However, as a policy index it measures the extent to which States promote and/or facilitate the integration of immigrants in various aspects of social life. To be clear, MIPEX captures ‘best practices’ relating to policies and not actual integration outcomes and these ‘best practices’ may in fact have no effect on immigrant integration outcomes. The actual measures used in MIPEX are thus of little use where actual integration is concerned. The MCP index is similar in this regard – it is focuses entirely on policy rather than outcomes.

Summary Assessment for a Canadian Index: Economic integration seems relatively simple to capture, using readily available data from Statistics Canada. The distinction between the short and long-term dimensions of economic integration also seem useful. Our way forward in the concluding remarks will include measures of each, largely drawn from the CIIS.

Social Integration of Immigrants

Index	Rating
IWA	5.5
HLI	7.8
MIPEX	7.6
CIIS	6.4
MIIA	6.25
MCP	7.5

The difficulty in measuring social integration is reflected in the difference between the ratings here and those in the preceding section. That said, although social integration is more difficult to measure, the six indices reviewed here offer some useful possibilities.

In this case, the HLI, MIPEX and MCP indices seem to offer the best overall approach. The MIIA, receiving the second lowest ranking, refers to ‘cultural assimilation’ rather than ‘social integration’. Four measures are used: 1) ability to speak English, 2) intermarriage (whether a spouse is native-born), 3) number of children, and 4) marital status. Our experts find the first two measures somewhat limited and are uncertain of how relevant are the third and fourth were.

Where the IWA is concerned, indicators for the Integration Index include notions of ‘social trust’ and ‘belonging’ – both survey-based measures that are important to our experts and are missing in all other indices. Note that the index also includes belonging to three different levels of community – Canada, the province and the local community – which our experts believe to be important. Civic engagement measures are also valuable additions. Other measures, as the experts note, are descriptive measures of the diversity of the setting rather than measures that indicate integration per se. The HLI also relies on a number of survey-based measures, amongst them the percentage of people reporting they have others to rely on if needed, self-reported health, life satisfaction, work-life balance and safety. Again, although the HLI is not particularly concerned with immigrant integration, it includes indicators that could be quite helpful in building an index of social integration for immigrants.

As noted above, the MIPEX and MCP indices focus more on policies aimed at integration rather than integration per se. Even so, family reunification, residency and nationality requirements may be useful indicators of potential social integration. Similarly, the anti-discrimination section of the MIPEX index may be valuable.

The CIIS receives a relatively low ranking overall on this dimension, but it includes a number of interesting measures such as indicators related to ‘warmth of welcome’. Examples of this are the media score, academic performance relative to whites, coverage of immigrant serving organizations, civic infrastructure for naturalization and English Language Learner supply relative to need. As one expert notes, these offer a sense of what is being done ‘on the ground.’ The CIIS is also

unique in its focus on what civil society does for immigrants and not just on what government does. The fact that the CIIS is able to do this without survey measures may be advantageous, given the relative lack of available survey data. That said, a lack of survey data means that the index lacks true individual outcomes (such as health outcomes or experiences with discrimination). There is also no clear measure of the host society's acceptance of immigrants.

Summary Assessment for a Canadian Index: A potential measure of social integration might combine attitudinal data (from surveys), including measures of civic engagement, with a number of 'environmental' measures similar to those found in the CIIS. Educational attainment in all likelihood is relatively easy to capture on a regular basis while other measures may require some independent data-gathering.

The Political Integration of Immigrants

Index	Rating
MIPEX	8.2
HLI	5.6
MCP	4.5
MIIA	3.5
CIIS	2.8

Of the types of integration examined here, political integration may be the toughest to measure. This, again, is illustrated in the ratings given to the six indices for this topic. This is also reflected in the variation of the types of measures used to capture integration in this area.

As another type of measure, the CIIS refers to 'civic' rather than 'political' integration; it recognizes the need and difficulty of having good indicators for immigrant voting and relies instead on 'linguistic integration' and 'naturalization rate(s)'. It is unclear if this measure is well suited within political integration given that this is closer to what we regard as social integration (this is reflected in the low score for the CIIS on political integration). The MIIA is similarly weak on this front: it includes naturalization rates, along with native-immigrant difference in rates of military service. There is some questioning amongst experts as to whether military service is actually a measure of political integration – we are not inclined to think so.

Summary Assessment for a Canadian Index: Few of the indices that we have reviewed do an effective job of capturing political integration. Overall, however, there are some useful insights, like how political integration should likely include some combination of civic and political participation measures, essentially focused on participation. Membership in political associations may also be useful, though it will likely require the use of survey data. Other measures should focus on policy, as in the MIPEX and MCP indices.

The Availability of Measures Over Time and Geographies

	Applicability across...			
	Countries	Canadian provinces	Canadian cities	Over time
MCP	9.8	6.3	4.3	9.0
MIPEX	9.5	5.3	4.5	6.8
HLI	9.3	7.8	7.3	7.8
MIIA	9.3	8.8	8.8	9.5
CIIS	5.5	7.8	8.8	6.5
IWA	5.3	8.5	8.6	7.5

This table shows mean ratings for each index across space and time. There are some relatively clear trends. The MIPEX and MCP indices are designed to measure policies across countries and over time. The MCP index in particular, which relies on a qualitative analysis of existing policies, receives high ratings in both regards. There is, however, relatively little within-country variance for many of these policies. The measures thus receive comparatively low ratings in terms of being able to capture variation across provinces. The message here is relatively clear: to the extent that an index relies on policy-related measures, cross-country comparisons are possible but within-Canada comparisons are mostly moot.

If the goal is an index that tracks change in integration over time and across provinces, we need measures that show variance across space and time. Some measures quite clearly will not achieve this end and notable in this regard are measures of citizenship policy. While they may offer insights into immigrant integration, they provide no real variance across provinces or over time. It follows that one objective in building an index is to focus on measures that will allow us to assess trends.

The opposite is true for the CIIS and IWA indices. The CIIS is very detailed, but also aims at comparing regions across California. There was a sense from our experts that this index is too complicated to be feasible across countries, though it could be adjusted to allow for interesting comparisons across cities or regions. Data gathering for this index is labour intensive, to be sure, but

potentially very revealing. Note that the CIIS also ‘normalizes’ the scores and expresses them in terms of “standard deviation above or below the mean.” This reduces their value for comparison across time. The IWA is similarly designed for comparison across cities; the fact that it relies largely on census data also makes it relatively easy to gather, though directly comparable measures will be somewhat more difficult to capture across countries.

The HLI and MIIA indices have received relatively high ratings across the board. Both include a wide range of indicators and as such include measures (sometimes different) that will work across provinces and cities or over time. Both have been estimated cross-nationally.

Summary Assessment for a Canadian Index: There is real variation in the degree to which different indicators can capture variance across time and space. Policy measures may be less useful within Canada, though they are the most easily gathered across countries. Census and survey-based measures will be useful in capturing within-Canada variations, but over time variations require regular surveys. Capturing cross-national variations in these measures will also be difficult due to a lack of directly comparable data.

Ease of Understanding

Index	Rating
MCP	8.6
HLI	8.4
MIPEX	8.0
MIIA	7.8
CIIS	6.8
IWA	5.8

Our experts regard the MCP as the most user-friendly with a comprehensive methodology and clear presentation of results. The index seen as the least user friendly is the IWA. The degree of data analysis and number of variables involved in the assessment of outcomes may be a factor in which our experts ranked the ease of understanding. We regarded this criterion as important because any future index should aim to be accessed and understood by the widest possible number of users. Clearly, indices must strike a balance between data depth and clarity of concepts and framework.

Potential for Policy Decisions

Index	Rating
MIPEX	8.8
MCP	8.6
HLI	8.0
MIIA	7.0
IWA	6.5
CIIS	6.4

Not surprisingly, our experts have collectively selected the MIPEX as the index that best informs policy decisions. This outcome is undoubtedly a function of MIPEX's design as a policy index. In effect, the ranking we observe is likely influenced by the extent to which it touches explicitly on policy. The challenge in a comprehensive index will be to make the data as relevant as possible to policy outcomes without directly evaluating the policy. In effect the data analysis should by inference enable strong conclusions to be made about policy outcomes. This said, it needs to be understood that it is no simple feat to establish causality around policy impacts on immigrant integration.

DISCUSSION AND THE WAY FORWARD

A Mixed Methods Index

Designing indices that seek to measure immigrant integration require some degree of creativity. Amongst the indices reviewed above, three of them employ empirical data in an effort to generate insights into the process of immigrant integration. Two of the indices (MIPEX and MCP) approach the measure of integration from a different perspective by attempting to assess 'best practices' relating to policies. They do not purport to measure veritable integration outcomes. Indeed, as rightly pointed out by one of our experts, the 'best practices' in the area of policy could in fact have no bearing whatsoever on immigrant integration. These indices are designed to provide information about multiculturalism policies in a standardized format that aids comparative research and contributes to the understanding of relations between the State and its minorities.

Yet the evaluation of policies that target or facilitate immigrant integration is a necessary exercise. In the absence of such an evaluation, our ability to rate policy effectiveness is diminished. It is for this reason that several governments engage auditors to evaluate specific programs. The so-labelled policy indices of MIPEX and MCP propose cross-national rankings by agreed upon standards that are established by credible specialists. In this regard, the users of such indices need to accept some consensus-based standards and/or acknowledge the credibility of the individuals

that have decided upon these standards.

For maximum effectiveness, an immigrant integration index needs to deploy a multi-dimensional/mixed methods approach. The challenge is to determine the nexus between the index that targets a policy assessment and the one that works from an empirical basis in order to report changes in the immigrant condition. While it may be self-evident, it is vital to keep in mind that there are multiple ways of conducting an empirical analysis. The compatibility and comparability between various data sets and the methods used to mine them will also create challenges in arriving at cumulative or composite statistical outcomes.

As opposed to one size fitting all, the mixed methods approach is best suited to assess various aspects of immigrant integration in building an index.

Economic integration is perhaps the simplest to measure as data is readily-available from Statistics Canada. Identifying short and long term changes in the immigrant's economic condition is definitely feasible.

As one of our expert's note, economic criteria should not dominate an index to the point that non-economic measures are undercut. Economic integration also possesses multiple dimensions which may intersect with educational attainment, entrepreneurship, cultural adjustment, mobility, citizenship acquisition and informal political participation.

Indicators related to human capital such as educational attainment can be valuable in explaining changes in the immigrant condition. However, since many immigrants to Canada have secured their education prior to their arrival, the indicator to be developed may either consider access to education in Canada and/or be used as a predictor/control factor to explain variations in immigrant integration (like for economic integration). Yet another question arising from the measurement of educational attainment is when and where controls become relevant in ensuring that empirically-based indicators take into proper account the evolution in the immigrant condition.

Capturing political integration is no simple task as evidenced in the indexes reviewed above. We have suggested that ideally political integration should include some combination of citizenship and political participation measures. Although it likely requires survey data, membership in political associations may also be useful.

As regards various other aspects of immigrant integration, alternate and/or diverse methodologies may also be needed in order to capture relevant phenomenon. Some observers insist that social integration indicators such as attachment to country or region/province are best captured empirically by employing survey data and constructing multiyear tracks.

A fundamental challenge does indeed emerge where mixed methods/multiple data sets are used in index construction. Doing so implies that the relationships between various dimensions of integration cannot be easily captured and most indicators must be treated on their respective merits and assigned their respective degrees of importance - something that cannot be simple to deter-

mine. Ideally, a large single dataset that captures many elements of integration with a statistically significant and reliable sample of immigrants would be available.

To meet potential challenges in index construction one needs to employ indicators that can capture change in the immigrant condition over time and space.

A regular immigrant integration survey would offer valuable insight and potentially help fill gaps in the index construction. The Longitudinal Immigration Database (IMDB) will cover some of these challenges. The need to cover the change in immigrant condition over time not only requires that change in the macro condition of immigrants be analyzed but that the time a particular group of immigrants has been established be taken into account. By consequence the IMDB may be the cornerstone around which a Canadian integration index is constructed.

Another area that needs attention in index construction is the use of terms. As one of our experts point out, the use of ‘assimilation’ as employed in one of the indices reviewed above would not work in the Canadian context. Moreover, measuring ‘assimilation’ via the degree to which immigrants tend to imitate the economic and social condition of the Canadian-born population might be problematic in a country that is committed to the principles of diversity. In effect, index construction on the basis of an immigrant/non-immigrant dichotomy may not offer meaningful results and rather yield misleading generalizations. Hence, there is a need to elaborate upon the sub-groups that constitute the ‘immigrant’ and ‘non-immigrant’ groups during the process of index construction.

As repeated by our experts, an index must compare integration along a number of variables. It should also allow for comparisons across defined jurisdictions and take into account relevant socio-demographics.

An index should also be as user friendly as possible to enable use by specialists as well as a broad spectrum of policy-makers and researchers interested in the phenomenon of integration, but with less experience in quantitative methods (though the index can offer access based on diverse levels of expertise). The index should be relatively simple to interpret. One of the experts argue against the use of procedures that score outcomes on the basis of ‘standard deviation away from the mean.’ Ideally, the index can offer different possibilities to analysts if the mixed methods approach were utilized.

APPENDIX A: EXPERT SCORECARD

1. Content:

Please rate the following indices on a scale from 0 (weakest) to 10 (strongest), based on the degree to which you feel they capture the following elements of immigrant integration. Your score (and comments) should reflect the inclusion of relevant, accurate indicators, as well as a solid, justifiable methodological means by which to combine these indicators.

- a) The economic integration of immigrants (i.e., employment, wages)
- b) The social integration of immigrants (i.e., social engagement)
- c) The political integration of immigrants (i.e., participation, involvement, in political decision-making)

2. Applicability and usability:

- a) Some measures are more or less readily available, or more or less applicable, across different ratdiscuss where possible) the following indices based on their potential applicability.
- b) The ease with which an index is understood may affect the extent to which it is used, both by policy makers and by the public. Please rate the following indices based on their ease of interpretation.
- c) One objective for an index is that it can be used to both evaluate and inform policy decisions. Please rate the following indices based on their potential in this regard.

3. Qualitative:

We are now interested in your qualitative assessment of the merits and flaws of the six existing indices. Most importantly, we are interested in your views of:

- a) What is more important in the development of an index on immigrant integration in Canada?
- b) Which elements of existing indices you would consider including, or adapting, for a prospective Canadian index?
- c) Are there additional elements you are aware of that should be included?
- d) Any recommendations regarding the methodology used to combine measures into an index on immigrant integration?

APPENDIX B DETAILED RATINGS

In relation to the scorecard depicted in Appendix A, this appendix includes every expert’s ratings of each index’s ability to capture immigrant integration by topic. Scores were distributed between 0 and 10 in terms of strength. “NA” (not applicable) and “Nr” (response not received) have been included where experts either stated that the index did not deal with the selected topic (NA) or they skipped over a rating (Nr).

Index Acronyms:

IWA - Integration and “Welcome-ability” Indexes; **HLI** - How’s Life? Index; **MIPEX** - Migrant Integration Policy Index; **CIIS** - California Immigrant Integration Scorecard; **MIIA** - Manhattan Institute’s Immigrant Assimilation Study; **MCP** - Multiculturalism Policy Index

The Economic Integration of Immigrants

	Rating (0-10)					
	Average	Bilodeau	Dasko	Harell	Satzewich	Wong
CIIS	9.6	9	9	10	10	10
MIIA	8.2	7	8	9	8	9
HLI	8.0	8	8	8	8	8
MIPEX	8.0	8	10	8	5	9
IWA	5.8	7	5	5	5	7
MCP	1.5	NA	NA	1	NA	2

The Social Integration of Immigrants

	Rating (0-10)					
	Average	Bilodeau	Dasko	Harell	Satzewich	Wong
HLI	7.8	8	8	6	9	8
MIPEX	7.6	8	9	7	5	9
MCP	7.5	7	7	5	Nr	6
CIIS	6.4	9	7	7	5	4
MIIA	6.3	7	7	5	Nr	6
IWA	5.5	7	5	3	5.5	7

The Political Integration of Immigrants

	Rating (0-10)					
	Average	Bilodeau	Dasko	Harell	Satzewich	Wong
MIPEX	8.2	8	10	9	5	9
HLI	5.6	6	6	6	4	6
IWA	5.0	8	5	5	4	3
MCP	4.5	NA	NA	6	NA	3
MIIA	3.5	3	5	6	Nr	0
CIIS	2.8	6	5	0	3	0

Availability of Measures Over Time and Geographies

Applicability Across Countries:

	Rating (0-10)					
	Average	Bilodeau	Dasko	Harell	Satzewich	Wong
MCP	9.8	9	Nr	10	10	10
MIPEX	9.5	9	Nr	9	10	10
HLI	9.3	9	Nr	9	10	9
MIIA	9.3	7	Nr	10	10	10
CIIS	5.5	6	Nr	8	2	6
IWA	5.3	7	Nr	3	5	6

Applicability Across Canadian Provinces:

	Rating (0-10)					
	Average	Bilodeau	Dasko	Harell	Satzewich	Wong
MIIA	8.8	8	Nr	10	10	10
IWA	8.5	8	Nr	8	9	9
HLI	7.8	7	Nr	9	8	8
CIIS	7.8	6	Nr	8	9	9
MCP	6.3	8	Nr	4	5	5
MIPEX	5.3	6	Nr	5	3	3

Applicability Across Canadian Cities:

	Rating (0-10)					
	Average	Bilodeau	Dasko	Harell	Satzewich	Wong
CIIS	8.8	8	Nr	10	9	8
MIIA	8.8	8	Nr	10	10	7
IWA	8.6	9	Nr	8	9	8.5
HLI	7.3	7	Nr	9	6	7
MIPEX	4.5	6	Nr	5	0	7
MCP	4.3	8	Nr	4	0	5

Applicability Over Time:

	Rating (0-10)					
	Average	Bilodeau	Dasko	Harell	Satzewich	Wong
MIIA	9.5	8	Nr	8	10	10
MCP	9.0	8	Nr	8	10	10
HLI	7.8	9	Nr	9	8	7
IWA	7.5	9	Nr	9	7.5	8.5
MIPEX	6.8	7	Nr	7	3	10
CIIS	6.5	4	Nr	4	5	9

Ease of Understanding

	Rating (0-10)					
	Average	Bilodeau	Dasko	Harell	Satzewich	Wong
MCP	8.6	9	10	6	10	8
HLI	8.4	9	8	10	8	7
MIPEX	8.0	9	9	7	6	9
MIIA	7.8	8	6	8	Nr	9
CIIS	6.8	6	6	8	6	8
IWA	5.8	8	7	3	2	9

Potential for Policy Decisions

	Rating (0-10)					
	Average	Bilodeau	Dasko	Harell	Satzewich	Wong
MIPEX	8.8	8	10	8	9	9
MCP	8.6	8	10	7	10	8
HLI	8.0	8	9	7	9	7
MIIA	7.0	5	7	7	9	7
IWA	6.5	8	5	5	Nr	8
CIIS	6.4	6	7	6	6	7

APPENDIX C: DETAILED COMMENTS FROM EXPERTS

We include below the detailed commentary submitted by each expert. Much of this commentary is taken into account in the preceding sections; we nevertheless cannot deal adequately with all the experts' comments, and so we include them here for those who want to look over the comments in more detail.

ANTOINE BILODEAU'S SUBMISSION

An index that shall measure 'integration outcomes'

Ideally, an index of integration in Canada should measure three types of realities, namely integration outcomes, policies, and 'on the ground' services. First, the index should include a wide range of indicators to measure actual 'integration outcomes' on the economic, social and political dimensions. This first characteristic is essential to document and understand what are the realities to which immigrants are confronted to. The six indices provide an important list of indicators. On the economic dimension, the indicators of the CIIS appear very complete.

On the social dimension, the following indicators found in the six indices reviewed appear quite relevant: social trust (IWA), belonging at local, provincial and national levels (IWA) – although this could be better put under the political dimension –, interethnic marriage (MIIA), ability to speak an official language (MIIA), % reporting they have people to rely on if needed (HLI), life-satisfaction (HLI). I would also emphasize the importance of the self-reported health indicator (HLI) or any other measure of immigrants' health – including psychological health. I believe the health dimension is too often neglected, as seen through the review of the indices.

In addition, with regards to the sense of belonging, Banting and Soroka (2012: 163) argue that it comprises both the feeling of attachment and the feeling of being accepted. Ideally, I believe the sense of belonging would be more helpful if it were unpacked along these two dimensions. While the former refers to the extent to which newcomers see themselves as members of the community, the latter rather refers to the extent to which they believe other people want them to become members of the community. The 'feeling of being accepted' appears as an important symbolic dimension (Bloemraad, 2006) that has also significant consequences for engagement with the host society (Bilodeau, 2013; White, Bilodeau and Nevitte, 2014). An index should therefore include both of these indicators of belonging.

On the political dimension, I would include citizenship, but also reported vote in local, provincial and federal elections (IWA), as well as membership in voluntary organizations (IWA). I believe it would also be important to include measures of political representation in local, provincial and federal institutions. There are an increasing number of studies on the topic and this dimension of immigrant political integration would need to be included in the index.

All of these indicators of integration outcomes discussed above for the economic, social and political dimensions would need to be – where applicable – comparable with the rest of the Canadian population. The idea behind the comparison with the rest of the Canadian population, in the same spirit as that of the HLI, is to capture “inequalities between groups,” here between immigrants and the Canadian-born population.

An index that shall measure ‘policies relevant to immigrant integration’

An integration index should measure the actual policies in place that are relevant to immigrant integration, as measured by the MIPEX and the MCP. This second dimension is important to make sense of the policies in place and to understand the normative orientations of various levels of governments. It is essential to establish a ‘repertoire’ of what is being done in principle. This is an important step to assess any possible link between integration outcomes and policies that are in effect. Both the broader perspective of the MIPEX and the more focused approach of the MCP appear relevant and helpful.

An index that shall measure ‘on the ground’ services for immigrants

The third dimension was less prominent in the six indices reviewed but is also important. The idea is to measure what is actually done ‘on the ground’ to support immigrants in the integration process. The ‘Welcome-ability’ Index (IWA) and ‘warmth of welcome’ (CIIS) capture this dimension well. The CIIS indicators measuring media coverage and the number of immigrant-serving organizations appear especially relevant. The idea is to measure the actual services and resources in place. This, of course, includes government services, but it also includes services offered by civil society. This third dimension is an important complement to the policy repertoires (as provided by the MIPEX and MCP) because policies might state important objectives but nevertheless fail to provide the support essential for reaching their objectives. Similarly, policies could be absent but civil society could nevertheless be very well organized and active.

Moreover, under this third dimension, it could be appropriate to include indicators of the receptivity of the host population to the presence of immigrants. This could include reported experience of discrimination by immigrants and the state of public opinion in different geographical areas with regards to immigration and ethnic diversity.

An index that shall provide a flexible platform easily adaptable for different purposes

Research and policy needs are numerous and diverse. Accordingly, an integration index should be a flexible platform that is easily adaptable for different purposes and objectives. This means that, as much as possible, the specific scores for each dimension (social, economic and political) as well as the score for each individual indicator should be accessible.

In evaluating the six available indices, I did not give much consideration to the weighting of the various indicators and dimensions. Although such weighting procedures may be helpful, the appropriate weights for each dimension and for each indicator within each dimension may vary significantly depending on the objectives. Policy-makers and researchers should be able to modulate the index by playing with the list and weights of indicators in order to build the index that best represents their needs and preoccupations.

In addition to enlarging the use and applicability of the index to a wide range of objectives, such a flexible index would allow for easy adjustment when our knowledge of integration dynamics evolves. For instance, under the political dimension, both citizenship and voting could be considered as equally important today, but we could realize in a few years that one of the two is more meaningful in assessing immigrant integration. An open and flexible index would allow researchers to change the relative importance of indicators accordingly, and to do so retroactively if necessary.

An index easy to interpret and to communicate

Finally, the index should be easy to interpret and to communicate as much as possible. From this perspective, I would not recommend to employ a normalization procedure as that used by the CIIS (scoring presented in terms of ‘standard deviation away from the mean’). Such a procedure is not only difficult to make sense of but it also reduces the utility of the index from a policy perspective and for comparison across time. Although such a procedure facilitates the comparison of units of analysis (regions in the case of the CIIS), it ‘blurs’ the image of integration that the index aims at providing. Often, the use of such an index is not just for comparison, but also for assessing policy needs. Measurement in terms of ‘standard deviation away from mean’ does not allow for such policy use; it does not indicate, for instance, what proportion of the immigrant population lives under the poverty threshold, but rather only indicates whether such proportion is higher or lower in my ‘region’

as opposed to another one, regardless of whether this level is ‘very high’ or ‘very low’. Similarly, with such a measurement, comparisons across time have value only relative to other regions. For instance, the score for a region could go up and immigrants in that region would appear to do better, but it could simply reflect the fact that other regions are not doing as well as they used to. Overall interpretation of such ‘normalized’ scores is thus challenging and of more limited policy use.

DONNA DASKO'S SUBMISSION

The six indices reviewed focus broadly on three aspects; policies (and programs/services) related to integration and related concepts (MIPEX, MPC), measures of actual immigrant integration (MIIA), or both (CIIS, IWA). Indices are calculated at different levels of aggregation: international, national, or community.

The most important aspects in the development of an index on immigrant integration in Canada

Integration should measure the extent to which immigrants attain equal or improved outcomes on socially important measures in comparison to the non-immigrant or majority population. Measures should also allow for the possibility that immigrants can achieve higher statuses than the non-immigrant population (for example, higher education levels), which is not accounted for in any of the six indices reviewed here. Although the indices measuring policies/programs/services are extremely valuable, Canada needs measures of immigrant integration at what the IWA researchers call the “individual” level. Such data can be aggregated or disaggregated to describe the extent to which immigrants are integrated at the provincial level, in different communities, by country of origin, year of immigration, gender, or other variables, depending on data availability. Community or national policies or programs can be analyzed as independent variables and their impact on integration outcomes can be measured, as the MIPEX researchers have suggested, but the focus of an index or indices in my view should be on outcomes.

An ideal index would include enough measures to adequately measure the concept of integration and its components, but not so many as to make the analysis impractical or difficult to understand. Looking at the six indices, the MIA analysis would come closest to what I think is needed for Canada, with adjustments and additions.

Elements to include or adapt for a prospective Canadian index

An index should include items related to economic integration, cultural/social integration, and political/civic integration. The six indices include many measures of economic integration which would be relevant to a Canadian index. These include: household income (HLI); employment rate (HLI); personal earnings for full-time workers (HLI); overskilled workers (CIA)

occupational ranking by income (MIA); home ownership (MIA, CIIS); education – number of years, % with post-secondary (MIA, CIIS, HLI).

Measures for labour force variables and education should be calculated for males and females separately.

Measures of cultural integration should include: ability to speak the majority language (English or French); feeling of belonging to a community, province or Canada (IWA); non-immigrant friends and colleagues (new); intermarriage (MIA).

When measuring cultural items, we must always be clear that we are not measuring the decline of ethnic characteristics (such as immigrant languages, or having immigrant friends, for example), but rather we are measuring the adoption of majority behaviours. The concept of integration assumes that people and groups can maintain immigrant identities while becoming part of majority societies

When it comes to civic/political integration, fewer measures are provided in the six indices. I think

an index should include: citizenship rate (MIA, CIIS); voted in recent election (s) (IWA); membership in organizations (IWA); follow national/local Canadian media (new).

Recommendations regarding methodology

With regard to methodological considerations, I agree with the IWA and CIA researchers that more weight – 50 percent – of any composite index created should be given to the economic factor items and less weight – 25 percent each – to the cultural and civic/political factor items. Factor scores should be developed for each factor. Within each factor, each item should be assigned equal weight. Standardization of all measures is necessary for the creation of any index. One valuable insight from the CIA researchers is the measurement of items as relative measures, where scores for immigrant groups are measured as ratios to non-immigrant groups. If this is feasible, it makes a great deal of sense to use such measures where possible, since it provides a built-in measure to compare immigrant outcomes with the non-immigrant/majority group. As mentioned above, measures should also take into account that immigrant scores on many items can actually exceed those of the non-immigrant group, as integration proceeds.

Comments on indices

Below are some relevant observations and comments on each of the six indices.

MCP: The MCP index measures multicultural policies according to eight criteria, and was developed primarily to analyze and measure multicultural policies in an international context. This is an excellent index; it measures policies in a way that is clear and easy to understand, yet also rigorous and complete. All eight measures are well reasoned and well described and relate to the concept being measured. All eight measures are given equal weight in the index scheme, which also seems justified. However, the index measures multicultural policies, which are not integration policies. Multiculturalism and multicultural policies are focused on the recognition, affirmation, respect for, and/or the promotion of cultural distinctiveness, whereas integration focuses on the extent to which immigrant/cultural minority groups are similar to majority groups. So this index is not generally applicable to measuring integration, with one exception. The criteria “affirmative action” is useful as one criterion if one were to go forward to create an index of integration policies at the national or community level. This would measure to extent to which a community, a province, or a country, for example, has policies, in the public or private sectors, aimed at removing barriers for, or assisting,

HLI: The How’s Life? Index is a comprehensive set of measures designed by the OECD to measure well-being across OECD countries, including Canada. Of the six indices reviewed, this is the only one that does not include measures that are specific to immigrant/cultural minority groups, since it is intended as a measure of quality of life to apply to general populations and nations. This is an excellent, comprehensive index, which is well researched and well-resourced. Eleven dimensions/topics are included, each with one to four indicators (measures), each of which in turn is given

equal weight within a topic. The index does not assign weights to the topics to create an overall index; rather, it assigns scores to each topic for each country, and analysts are invited to create their own composite index. Measures are taken from aggregated individual data (for example, income levels, self-reported health status) and non-individual data sources (for example, the level of pollution, the homicide rate). Although the authors suggest that analyses cannot be done at the sub-national level, the data sources used (censuses, large national and international data sources), would suggest that data might be available and analyzable for groups and population segments within countries.

MIPEX: The Migrant Integration Policy Index was developed in order to analyze and compare policies with respect to immigrant integration. It is an excellent, very comprehensive and well-resourced effort, which analyzes 148 measures grouped into four dimensions for each of seven policy areas across 31 countries, including Canada. Like the MPI, policies are scored on a three-point scale, but are then converted into a scale of 1 to 100. The index is by far the most developed effort to analyze policy areas related to immigrant integration and in spite of its depth and breadth, it is still quite clear and easy to understand. However, the significant number of policies analyzed would make any attempt to replicate it within Canada, say, at the provincial or community level, a massive exercise, too unwieldy and impractical; it is just too large. A streamlined version of the index might be developed using the same seven policy areas, but with a much shorter list of indicators within each area.

MIIA: Measuring Immigrant Assimilation in Post-Recession America is a valuable analysis and index of factors and indicators measuring current and historical trends in the extent to which immigrants in the USA are assimilated, which is defined as the degree to which immigrants are similar or different from the non-immigrant population. In spite of its use of the term “assimilation”, the analysis and resulting indices are extremely helpful to understanding the concept of immigrant integration. The author identifies three types of assimilation: economic (measured using six factors), cultural (four factors) and civic (two factors). Three separate indices are constructed using these measures, as well as a composite index. The extent to which variables are relevant to distinguishing immigrants from non-immigrants is determined by statistical analysis.

The analysis benefits from its relative simplicity and clarity, in that it is not overwhelmed by large numbers of measures. As well, the analysis is valuable since it can be performed on sub-groups of the American immigrant population according to country of origin, metropolitan area, date of immigration, and other sub-groups. The main critique of it, from the Canadian perspective, is that some of the indicators do not appear to be relevant to the Canadian experience of integration; for example, the use of military service as a measure of civic assimilation and possibly other variables.

CIIS: The California Immigrant Integration Scorecard is a comprehensive analysis focused on measuring immigration integration at the community level, among California communities and regions. The authors create an index or scorecard based on economic factors (current and trend line), warmth of welcome of communities, and civic engagement of communities. A mixture of aggregated individual-level data and community level data (such as local media coverage of immigration issues) is used. An innovative feature of the analysis is the use wherever possible of

relative measures that take into account not only the immigrant population itself but the non-immigrant population, such as ratios of immigrant income to non-immigrant income, to measure gaps between immigrants and the comparison groups. The scorecard is also valuable in identifying a number of variables that would seem useful in the measurement of immigrant integration, such as “rent burden” and the percentage of overskilled workers.

IWA: The Integration and Welcome-ability Indices is a laudable effort to create two indices with which to measure immigrant integration in the Canadian context: an individual-level integration index and a community “welcome-ability” index. The analysis is a work-in-progress rather than a finished product. The conceptualization of the community index is more complete than the integration index and although some variables (for example, transportation) seem out of place and others (social capital) are not explained, the resulting analysis (where variables are rejected from the model via factor analysis) produces useful results for the community level. Unfortunately, the conceptualization of the integration index confuses this concept with social cohesion, to the detriment of the analysis. Also, there are too few variables in the integration analysis and one key variable “trust in people”, in my view, lacks face validity. The value of the whole analysis is to provide a good frame-work for a more extensive analysis, and to identify Canadian data sources and data gaps.

ALLISON HARELL'S SUBMISSION

As Pastor et al. (2012, 1) note, immigrant integration is “as a dynamic, two-way process in which newcomers and the receiving society both have a responsibility for integration, and both benefit as they work together to build secure, vibrant, and cohesive communities.” Any index of integration must capture this dynamic process, and to do so, it must capture both macro level policy and micro level attitudes and behavior, and must focus on both immigrants and non-immigrants. The measures under consideration here often fail to capture both these dimensions. Below I discuss what I think are some of the keys to capturing the phenomenon. I then conclude with a suggestion of how to move forward.

Connecting macro and micro level phenomenon

One of the most important aspects in developing an immigration integration index, in my opinion, is ensuring that integration is examined at both the micro and macro level, and to develop indicators at both levels that are distinct enough to be able to analyse how factors at one influence the other. Some of the indices under consideration focus almost exclusively on one level or the other (for example, the HLI and CIIS relies heavily on individual level outcomes, whereas the MCP and MIPEX focuses specifically on policy). This is one of the strengths, in particular, of the IWA index which explicitly theorizes integration at both levels. Yet, in practice the IWA fails to effectively translate this insight into practice. There appears to be some confusion in how indicators are operationalized at each level for the IWA. For example, in Figure 2, a macro-to-macro relationship is posited, yet includes items such as positive attitudes toward immigrants which is a micro level

variable. Another example is Table 1 which includes ‘sense of belonging’ as a macro indicator but it is a micro level phenomenon.²

While the IWA does a poor job of operationalizing this idea, one way forward would be to combine the best policy measures as one dimension of an integration index with an individual outcome dimension. This allows for the relationship between policies and outcomes to be analyzed, both in terms of how the two co-vary, but also how changes in one dimension can influence changes in the other.

It is also important to note that the CIIS is perhaps the only one that captures policy outcomes at a more macro level (for example, looking at number of service organizations available for immigrants or media cover-age of immigration issues). This might be a useful addition to an index that captures social outcomes primarily at the individual level.

Comparing immigrants to newcomers rather than focusing on newcomers

It is essential when creating indications of integration that they be relative measures, rather than brute measures. This is especially important (and practical) when dealing with data that can be easily collected from both immigrants and non-immigrants. This is a particular strength of the CIIS, where the economic variables are scored compared to US-born non-Hispanic whites (the MIIC also uses some relative measures). While one could argue that using the “most” integrated population as the benchmark is problematic in a diverse society, relative measures at minimum should be used against the non-immigrant population more generally. This is a shortcoming of other indices, such as the IWA and HLI. While the HLI was not designed for this, the IWA is particularly problematic on this front. For example, they measure things such as the percentage of immigrants who have access to a family doctor in a community but if this is not relativized in terms of how many non-immigrants have access to the same, the number is meaningless.³

Integration is about becoming equal members of a host society, so the measure of integration requires that we know if immigrants have the same opportunities as the host society. This is one area where the HLI could be transformed into something more like the CIIS. While it was designed as a general life quality index, relative measures on some of the key dimensions could be used to compare how immigrants compare to non-immigrants. I think this would be a very powerful way forward with indicators that are clear and already captured across a number of contexts.

² Furthermore, the causal order in their account is debatable. The authors of the IWA posit a causal order in Figure 1 (Ravanera et al. 2013, p. 5), but there is no reason to assume a priori that the direction cannot be reversed. For example, individual level conditions and characteristics may contribute to the macro level, rather than vice versa (arrow 3 in figure 1), just as macro integration outcomes (welcome-ability) may influence micro level outcomes (integration) rather than vice versa. In fact, policy as a cause is explicitly proposed in the MIPEX. This is why measuring both levels is essential in order to tease out the causes of immigrant integration.

³ It should be noted that when it comes to the IWA’s individual analysis, they do provide comparisons to non-immigrants.

Discrimination and accommodation

A lot of the focus is on immigrants, but equal importance needs to be placed on how accommodating the host society is. This is clearly one of the strengths of the MCP and the MIPEX variable, which looks specifically at policies that are in place on these dimensions. At the individual level, it is important to also capture immigrants' experiences with discrimination.

There is one particularly problematic attempt at measuring issues around discrimination and accommodation in the IWA, where indicators of raw diversity are included in the macro level analysis. The percentage of visible minorities is not an indicator of integration, nor should it be used as one. Being from a racializing minority (whether one is an immigrant or not) can certainly create additional barriers to integration in society, and it is important to recognize how immigrants often face racial prejudice. But equating diversity with issues of integration is a longstanding problem of theorizing and social cohesion, and it absolutely needs to be avoided in order to distinguish various components of integration from each other, as well as from the context in which integration occurs.

Including interaction and immigrant-non-immigrant relationships

At the micro-level, one of the items that is often posited as important is how immigrants and host society members actually interact with one another, yet this is rarely included in the measures. Ideally, a measure of immigrant/non-immigrant interaction would be useful. The HLI does include one item along this line of thinking based on having someone to rely on in times of need as does the MIIA index which includes inter-marriage rates. But in general, there is very little across these indices that captures how immigrants interact in their everyday life with host society members. Are immigrants segregated? Do they experience discrimination in spite of policies that prohibit it?

Relatedly, how welcoming a society depends in part on the attitudes that the host society holds towards newcomers. This was another aspect that was under-developed across these indices. The CIIS included the media tone on immigration issues, which I found to be an innovative indicator for the general climate of an area. An alternative would be to measure host societies' attitudes toward diversity (which were briefly mentioned in the IWA, although not operationalized).

Any new index of immigrant integration should include separate but related measures

These measures include: 1) immigrant integration policy (drawing in part from the MIPEX and MCP lists); 2) micro level social outcomes on the three dimensions (economic, social, and political) that focuses on immigrants-non-immigrant gaps, as well as experiences between the two groups; and 3) macro level social climate (such as the tone of media debate, or direction of public opinion).

It is necessary when doing this, I think, to create a list that is both relatively short, yet comprehensive across domains of interest to immigrant integration. In terms of integration policy, I would suggest using a substantially shortened version of the MIPEX. The more difficult challenge, how-

ever, is creating a restricted yet comprehensive list of micro-level indicators. In terms of the economic domain, many of the indices discussed here provide useful and relatively straightforward indicators that could be adapted to a new index. The challenge is creating measures of the social and political domains. The social domain, in my opinion, could be captured nicely by creating immigrant-non-immigrant scores on many of the HLI items. I would additionally add some objective indicator of immigrant-non-immigrant interaction. The political domain could combine some of the useful items across indices. Finally, one of the limits of the indices considered here is that there are few measures of macro-level social climate included. As many of the approaches (excluding the MIIA), take a view that integration is a two-way street, then it seems essential to not only consider how well immigrants are integrating into society, but how well the host society is adjusting to the presence of these immigrants.

VICTOR SATZEWICH'S SUBMISSION

The most important aspects in the development of an index on immigrant integration in Canada

Though measures of immigrant integration that focus on the existence of various policies that shape opportunities for immigrants to integrate into a society (such as the MCP and MIPEX) are interesting ways to make comparisons between countries, my strong preference is for an index of immigrant integration that focuses on the actual experiences of immigrants and/or their position in a society. Too often, discussions of immigrant integration seem obsessed with certain 'policies' (such as multiculturalism), and tend to assume that the existence or non-existence of a policy determines how immigrants actually behave and/or relate to their adopted homelands. While there are obvious ways in which structural opportunities to integrate interact with actual experiences of the integration process, an index that focuses primarily on 'outcomes' (as suggested by the CIIS) is more valuable than an index that measures the existence of policies.

As suggested by the authors of the CIIS report, a good index should be theoretically grounded (pg. 5). As a result, care needs to be taken in both the terminology and logic used to construct an index. The idea behind an 'assimilation index' along the lines of the MIIA is certainly an interesting and potentially useful measure of how immigrants are doing in a society, but such an index would not likely go over well in Canada. That is, measuring 'assimilation' by the extent to which immigrants mimic the social profile of the native born population of Canada would be conceptually problematic in a country that is committed to the principles of multiculturalism. While processes of 'assimilation' may be compatible with the principles of multiculturalism, an index that uses the terminology of 'assimilation' would prove to be distracting and undermine its potential utility.

Moreover, measuring the extent to which immigrants become socially and economically indistinguishable from the native-born population is an example of what Peter Li describes as one of the conceptual problems of 'benchmarking'. The problem with benchmarking is that it assumes that 'immigrants are useful to Canada if only they are similar to Canadians.'⁴ Such an index would gen-

⁴ Peter Li, *Destination Canada: Immigration Debates and Issues*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2003, pp. 50-54.

erate debate that would distract from, rather than illuminate, processes of immigrant integration.

In my ideal world, an immigrant integration index would be able to measure immigrant integration along a number of variables. An index that compares integration along a number of variables in Canada is more useful than one that compares broader patterns of integration between countries. The following variables are what I consider to be the most important in developing a measure of immigrant integration:

- Levels of immigrant integration seem to vary by the legal category immigrants arrive under. The academic literature suggests that there are notable socio-economic differences between those admitted as refugees and family class immigrants and those admitted under various ‘economic’ categories. And, from a public policy point of view, the federal government is shifting emphasis towards admitting more ‘economic’ immigrants on the grounds that they make stronger contributions to Canadian society. And, there is considerable debate about the growth in various categories of temporary foreign workers in Canada and the associated bridging mechanisms that allow them to transition to permanent resident status. Some aspects of that debate touch explicitly on concerns about ‘integration’ and so ideally, a measure of immigrant integration would also be able to measure their experiences of Canadian society. This is, of course, easier said than done. The census does not contain information on the category of immigration, and so a special survey would likely be required. Alternatively, perhaps data from the Longitudinal Immigrant Data Base (IMDB) could be used.

- Another important variable is country of origin. Public policy and academic debates in Canada also focus on how well immigrants from different countries are doing in Canadian society. Given the prominence of ‘ethnicity’ and ‘race’ in debates about immigration in Canada (and elsewhere), and the view that ‘visible minorities’ integrate in ways that are different from ‘non-visible minorities’, a measure of integration that focuses on immigrants of different origins would be valuable. In addition, an ability to compare how immigrants from various countries are integrating over time would also be valuable. The CIIS is able to do this fairly well.

- Gender and generation are also important fault lines when it comes to discussions of immigrant integration. Discussions of ‘home grown’ terrorism, attachment and loyalty to Canada, and the long term consequences of multicultural policy often indirectly speak to processes that are related to the integration of second generation and ‘1.5’ generation individuals in Canada.

- An index that is able to measure integration at some sub-provincial (community) level would be also useful. Immigrants, like other Canadians, live their everyday lives in the context of local communities. An index that is sensitive to community differences in immigrant integration, such as the ‘IWA’, can potentially tell us much about how immigrants fare in the communities they live in.

Elements to include or adapt for a prospective Canadian index

In terms of measures or indicators of integration, the differentiation between economic, social

and political levels of immigrant integration is useful and should be retained. A single composite index is valuable, but so too is the ability to compare the relationship between different dimensions of immigrant integration (that is, the relationship between economic, political and social integration). The CIIS is particularly useful in this regard.

For 'economic' integration, the usual measures of integration include data on housing conditions and/or home ownership, educational level, unemployment, labour force participation, occupational distribution and individual level earnings.

For social integration, some indices include measures of health and well-being, English language abilities (and French), intermarriage. Some also include measure of volunteerism, the existence of social networks and friendship patterns. The social science literature on social capital identifies 'trust' as an indicator of integration.

For political integration, most indices emphasize the acquisition of citizenship as a key indicator of integration. Finer measures of political integration are usually at the policy level and include the ability to vote, stand in elections, and "influence the political process". Some of these variables are not easily measured in Canada.

Additional elements to be included

Most indices measure 'economic integration' at the individual level. This is entirely appropriate, but I would also like to see an index that measures household level income and/or wealth. Immigrants, like other Canadians, often make important economic decisions based on household considerations and familial survival strategies, rather than simply on individual level cost-benefit analyses. A measure of integration that includes a nod to the fact that immigrants live their lives in the context of households could be valuable.

There is a good rationale behind the 'Welcome-Ability Index' (IWA). Though my preference is for an index that measures how immigrants actually integrate, there is value in a measure that tries to capture the preparedness of communities to be accepting of immigrants. I am not sure how it could be improved upon.

Recommendations regarding methodology

Ideally, an index should be derived from data collected in a national level census/national household survey. This would allow comparisons over time, and should mean that the 'Ns' are high enough to allow for the examination of variations in integration along some of the dimensions as noted above.

At the same time, special surveys like The Ethnic Diversity Survey (2003) are valuable because they can ask specific questions that are not asked in the census/NHS and are able to explore

finer grains of the integration experience. The EDS provided a wealth of useful data to help researchers and policy makers understand the experiences of ethnic and racial group members in Canada. These surveys are expensive and may be difficult to repeat over time. However, were the resources available, a regular 'immigrant integration' survey would be very valuable investment for Canadian researchers, policy makers and the public. A regular immigrant integration survey administered in regular (say five-year) intervals would produce a wealth of data that would allow us to compare different immigrant groups, and their experiences over time. It would also help to demystify some of the debates about immigrant integration, which tends to focus on how people think immigrants are integrating rather than how they are actually integrating. Such an effort would have real academic and public policy value.

LLOYD WONG'S SUBMISSION

The most important aspects in the development of an index on immigrant integration in Canada

Given that there is no absolute definition of what "immigrant integration" really means, what is important is for the creators of an immigrant integration index to know for what purposes the index will be used.

For example, in work I have done on the development of an immigrant integration index using the individual level data from the EDS, the primary purpose was to compare what the index score would be for immigrants compared to non-immigrants (native-born) and then secondarily to do other comparative analysis (visible minority vs non-visible minority, gender, generations, etc.). On this point, the integration index scores were not that different between immigrants and native-born, (8.98 vs 10.06) with the range from 0 to 12.7. While statistically significant, this is not a particularly large difference. Having read the documents for this review, the work of Ravanera, Esses and Fernando (2013, p. 19-20) corroborates my finding where their average integration scores comparing immigrants with non-immigrants are also not very large (0.70 vs 0.76).

What is also important to me is that economic variables or measures do not dominate an index to the point that non-economic measures are not fully explored. This moves away from economic determinism where the assumption is that economic integration has primacy and that all other forms of non-economic integration will follow suit after economic integration.

Further, it is important to aim for multi-level analysis as suggested by Ravanera et al. (2013) in their conclusion.

Elements to include or adapt for a prospective Canadian index

IWA: Percent employed, household income, annual personal income, sense of belonging, trust, voting, membership in organizations

HLI: Household wealth, job security, quality of support network, voter turnout, life satisfaction

MIPEX: 1.1 all the access variables, 3.3 all the new opportunity measures, 3.4 all, and all of 4.4 implementation policies

CIIS: Media Score variables are interesting, linguistic integration, naturalization rate (high in Canada so not much of a variable)

MIIA: Inter-marriage

MCP: School curriculum, media, funding ethnic groups, bilingual education and affirmative action

Additional elements to be included

When measuring trust, it should be differentiated by context, for example, trust in neighbors, trust in colleagues (co-workers), etc.

The measure “sense of belonging” should also be differentiated by context with sense of belonging to Canada being foremost. There need to be more social-psychological measures developed under what I would call “identification” integration.

While at the policy level the MCP considers affirmative action policies the other side of the coin, at the individual level, would be measures of discrimination. The EDS had an excellent set of questions on discrimination and this phenomenon should be considered for an immigrant integration index.

Civic or social participation measures should also try to ascertain the intensity of the participation, that is how often within a given time period. It is not only a question of “do you participate?” but more information is gleaned by asking “how often?”.

More political participation variables should be developed that move beyond voting behavior and include participation in political party activities or other forms of political behavior such as lobbying for causes etc. Some aspects of volunteering are related to political participation so in this regard they should be considered.

Social networks and friendships should be considered as measures of immigrant integration. The measurement of social networks/friendships would allow analysis of those in the networks (business connections/friendships) who are co-ethnic/non co-ethnic, immigrant/non-immigrant, etc. and do reflect certain aspects of integration at the micro-level.

Recommendations regarding methodology

As per the suggestion of Ravanera et al. (2013, p. 21-22) moving toward a multi-level analysis of

immigrant integration is desirable where macro/community (or region or nation) outcomes and conditions are interconnected to micro-individual outcomes and conditions looking at both immigrants and non-immigrants. Further, I would argue that where possible, micro individual-level data and macro/community level data be linked or incorporated. For example, the HLI incorporated some variables that were generated at the micro individual-level (Gallup). Similarly, micro individual-level survey could incorporate neighbor-hood, city, or provincial macro level data.

Statistical techniques, such as factor analysis, can be used to help create an immigrant integration index. Most of the indices reviewed did not use factor analysis except for the IWA. Other integration indices developed using individual level data that have used factor analysis include the work of Reinsch (2001) and Wong and Tezli (2013). Indices that do not use factor analysis are not really creating an index in the statistical sense but maybe this is not important.

Comments on indices

IWA: The methodology at Community Level is excellent and the use of factor analysis important.

HLI: The utilization of 11 key dimensions with 24 variables to measure these 11 dimensions is fairly comprehensive. Some of these 11 dimensions would not likely apply to an integration index, for example, the environment dimension and the work-life balance dimension.

Most of the 24 variables are national interval-ratio level data and are “objective” measures. A few are subjective measures taken from large-N surveys such as the Gallup World Poll on “life satisfaction” and “quality of support network” and the OECD health database on “self-reported health”. The value of the HLI would be to look at nativity differences in order to track immigrant/non-immigrant (native-born) inequality and to have those differences as a measure of immigrant integration.

CIIS: This is a good example of an attempt at multi-level analysis to create an integration index score for regional comparisons. There is the utilization of both community level data with individual level data to create an index score for a particular region of California.

MIPEX: The measures in MIPEX pertain to the existence of policies which are categorized into 7 areas and are measured by 148 variables. Calculation of scores is derived from a simplistic ordinal level data that has just 3 ranks. Methodologically the index is straight forward and easy to understand. The major assumption of the index is that the existence of particular policies does have an effect on the actual integration of immigrants. Clearly, some scholars would question the validity of this assumption and argue that it is not the existence of policy that really affects integration but rather is it actual implementation of policies.

It's my understanding that the current MIPEX project currently may go slightly beyond state policies and include an evaluative component by independent scholars and practitioners in migration law, education and anti-discrimination (Huddleston and Niessen 2011, 7). Previously MIPEX

provided analysis of specific countries and not immigrant populations within those countries per se. Over 200 policy indicators are used and include some which are complex and highly multi-dimensional as well as background data that includes public perceptions, and additional statistics. The most recent MIPEX report includes Canada which is ranked number three out of thirty-one countries in terms of an overall integration index score behind Sweden and Portugal (Huddleston and Niessen 2011, 11).

MIA: The Manhattan Institute's recent initiative to measure immigrant assimilation in the United States has garnered much attention in the literature with four major published reports (Vigdor 2008; 2009; 2011; 2013). An *Index of Immigrant Assimilation* was created that has three component indexes: 1) economic assimilation, 2) cultural assimilation, and 3) civic assimilation and is used to measure the degree of similarity or dissimilarity between native and foreign-born adults in the United States. Data used for the development of index and measurement were provided by the U.S. Bureau of Census. In the Institute's recent analysis of the assimilation index, which was developed in 2008 and 2009, there was a comparison of various countries in Europe and Canada wherein Canada ranks highest in overall assimilation due primarily to higher rates of naturalization than other countries. It should be noted that data for Canada came from the 2001 Census (Vigdor, 2011). The shortcoming of the Manhattan Institute's index of immigrant assimilation is that it utilizes essentially behavioural and objective indicators from government census data. Thus the subjective dimensions of assimilation or integration tend to be absent in census type data. This absence of the more subjective and social psychological dimensions has been recognized by some researchers such as Choi and Madhavappallil (2009) in the U.S. whose research indicate that the attitude toward integration is important and is likely to influence the integration process. They make the case for subjective attitudinal variables along with behavioural variables to measure integration.

MCP: This is not strictly a measure of immigrant integration but rather of multiculturalism policy. There are no individual-level measures.

Final Comments

While MIPEX provides valuable data for comparative analysis of many countries in terms of a migrant integration policy index, many home-grown research studies have emerged in specific European countries. Phalet and Swyngedouw (2003) measure immigrant integration in Belgium not so much by developing a single index but rather use a series of exemplary measures related to socio-economic, cultural and political dimensions of immigrant integration. They use the Belgium census and a series of special surveys and argue that the integration process is best conceived as multidimensional where they look at educational and occupational attainment, economic activity, self-employment, acculturation and mobility strategies, identity, citizenship and informal political participation. Many of these indicators were similar to ones identified by the Council of Europe work in the late 1990s. Baldwin-Edwards (2005) also used census data in a study of immigrants in Athens, Greece to develop indicators and statistical measures of their integration. While identifying similar variables and indicators to other studies, such as: (a) legal integration, (b) labour market,

(c) housing and urban issues, (d) education and language skills, (e) health and social services, (f) social and cultural integration, and (g) nationality, civic citizenship and respect for diversity, he also suggested stages of immigrant integration thus adding a temporal component. His stages include: 1) residence and employment, 2) family grouping and settlement, and 3) formation of ethnic communities and/or assimilation.

REFERENCES

**in addition to the six reviewed indices literature*

Baldwin-Edwards, M. 2005. *The Integration of Immigrants in Athens: Developing Indicators and Statistical Measures*. http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/en/resources/detail.cfm?ID_ITEMS =18593 [accessed January 24, 2012]

Choi, J. B. and T. Madhavappallil. 2009. *Predictive Factors of Acculturation Attitudes and Social Support Among Asian Immigrants in the USA*. *International Journal of Social Welfare* 18.1: 76-84.

Huddleston, T., and J. Niessen (with E. N. Chaoimh and E. White). 2011. *Migrant Integration Policy Index III*. Brussels: Migrant Integration Policy Index, British Council and Migration Policy Group.

Malu, M. and M. Rosenboim. 2010. *Ruppin Index of Immigrant Integration in Israel*. Emek Hefer: Ruppin Academic Center.

Phalet, K. and M. Swyngedouw. 2003. *Measuring Immigrant Integration: The Case of Belgium*. *Studi Emigrasi-one-Migration Studies XL*, no. 152: 773-803.

Reinsch, P. 2001. *Measuring Immigrant Integration – Diversity in a European City*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

Vigdor, J. 2008. *Measuring Immigrant Assimilation in the United States*. [No. 53 Civic Report]. New York: Manhattan Institute.

Vigdor, J. 2009. *Measuring Immigrant Assimilation in the United States*. [Second Edition, No. 59 Civic Report]. New York: Manhattan Institute.

Vigdor, J. 2011. *Comparing Immigrant Assimilation in North America and Europe*. [No. 64 Civic Report]. New York: Manhattan Institute.

Wong, L. and A. Tezli. 2013. *Measuring Social, Cultural, and Civic Integration in Canada: The Creation of an Index and Some Applications*. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 45.3: 9-37.

Literature that has not been discussed above but may warrant examination:

Bijl, R. 2008. *Evaluating the Social Integration of Immigrants: How to Measure Successes and Failures?* Presentation made at the Presentation at the Villa Vigoni Conference - Social Reporting In Europe, Migration and Integration, March 16-18, 2008, Villa Vigoni, Italy, <http://www.gesis.org/?id=2043> [accessed December 3, 2011].

Coussey, M. and E. Christensen. 1997. *Indicators of Integration*. In *Measurement and Indicators of Integration*, ed. Council of Europe, 15-22. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/migration/documentation/Series_Community_Relations/Measurement_indicators_integration_en.pdf [accessed December 16, 2011].

Eurostat. 2011. *Indicators of Immigrant Integration*. A Pilot Study – 2011 edition. Luxembourg: European Union, <http://www.emnbelgium.be/publication/eurostat-study-indicators-immigrant-integration> [accessed January 24, 2012].

Fitzgerald Marian. 1997. *Measurements and Indicators of Integration*. In *Measurement and Indicators of Integration*, ed. Council of Europe, 56-67. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/migration/documentation/Series_Community_Relations/Measurement_indicators_integration_en.pdf [December 16, 2011].

Goodman, S. W. 2010. *Integration Requirements for Integration's Sake? Identifying Categorising and Comparing Civic Integration Policies*. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36, no. 5: 753-772.

Immigrant Integration Indicators, 2007. *Immigrant Integration Indicators – Proposal For Contributions to the Formulation of a System of Common Integration Indicators*. http://www.wodc.nl/images/1365_fulltext_tcm44-80242.pdf [accessed December 23, 2011].

Jackson, P. 2009. *Measuring Muslim Integration in Europe*. *Democracy and Security* 5, no. 3: 223-248. Jiménez, T. 2011. *Immigrants in the United States: How Well Are They Integrating into Society?* Washington: Migration Policy Institute.

Lauer, S. R. 2008. *Immigration, Voluntary Associations, and Diverse Friendship Ties*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Sheraton Boston and the Boston Marriott Copley Place, Boston, MA Online<PDF>, http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p242420_index.html [accessed December 23, 2011].

Sciences-po. 2008. *Measuring Integration-The French Case. Regional Indices of Social and Labor Market Insertion of Third Country Nationals*. Paris: Centre d'études et de recherches internationales, http://www.ceri-scienc-es-po.org/cefrfr/transversal/french_report.pdf [accessed December 16, 2011].

A CANADIAN INSTITUTE FOR IDENTITIES AND MIGRATION PUBLICATION, 2016

This report was prepared for Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada
Originally published September 2014, re-printed June 2016