

Wilfrid Laurier University

Scholars Commons @ Laurier

Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)

2009

A Systems Theory Examination of Factors Related to Inclusive Attitudes Towards Newcomers and Racial Minorities

Shannon A. Veurink
Wilfrid Laurier University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd>



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Veurink, Shannon A., "A Systems Theory Examination of Factors Related to Inclusive Attitudes Towards Newcomers and Racial Minorities" (2009). *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 924.
<https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/924>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive) by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.



Library and
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-49993-1
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-49993-1

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

FACTORS INFLUENCING INCLUSIVE ATTITUDES

A Systems Theory Examination of Factors Related

To Inclusive Attitudes Towards

Newcomers and Racial Minorities

by

Shannon A. Veurink

B.A. (Hons) Business Administration, Royal Military College of Canada, 2003

B.Sc. (Hons) Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington, 2004

THESIS

Submitted to the Faculty of Social Work

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for

Master of Social Work

Wilfrid Laurier University

2009

© Shannon Veurink, 2009

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between certain social aspects of education and community experiences and how they relate to inclusive attitudes towards ethnic and racial minorities. A self-report, internet hosted survey was administered (N=672) in order to assess participants' Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance, as well as their educational and community-based experiences. Correlation and regression testing was completed to examine the relationships between education and community system experiences and inclusiveness. The findings of this study support the notion that experiences occurring within various social systems relate differently with inclusive attitudes. Implications and future research directions are recommended, as well as discussions about alternative ways of conceptualizing interethnic attitudes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to so many. I would like to thank my advisor, Martha Kuwee Kumsa for her brilliance and commitment. Thank you to my faithful committee members, Marina Morgenshtern and Susan Cadell, for journeying with me through each step. I thank the hundreds of research participants who made this project possible. I thank my family and friends for constant encouragement. I thank all of those teachers, pastors, coaches, mentors and friends who have helped me to see the beauty in every person and culture. I thank my incredible husband, Kevin.

I thank God – for creating, and blessing me so richly through everyone mentioned above.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
 CHAPTER 1: Introduction	 1
 CHAPTER 2: Literature Review	 4
<i>Contact Theory</i>	4
<i>Ethnic Presence</i>	9
<i>Threat</i>	10
<i>Learning, Ritual/Social Density & Cultural Knowledge</i>	13
<i>Education</i>	15
<i>Individual Differences</i>	16
<i>Summary of Criticisms and Rationale for Proposed Research Direction</i>	17
 CHAPTER 3: Methodology.....	 22
<i>Paradigm and Theoretical Framework</i>	22
Post-Positivism	22
Quantitative Research	24
Systems Theory.....	25
Anti-Oppressive Consciousness.....	27
<i>Research Overview</i>	29
Design	30
Variables	31
Hypotheses	35
<i>Procedure</i>	36
Overview.....	36
Ethics	36
Compensation	38
Sampling	39

Participants.....	39
Measure.....	40
Data Analysis.....	44
CHAPTER 4: Findings	46
<i>Correlational Analyses</i>	46
Aggregate Correlations	46
Correlation Trends for Attitudes Towards Immigration	48
Correlation Trends for Tolerance.....	51
<i>Regression Analyses</i>	52
<i>Regression Models for Attitudes Towards Immigration</i>	52
Approach 1: Regressing According to Level of Education/Community Involvement	52
Approach 2: Regressing According to Qualities and Components.....	53
Approach 3: Regressing Combinations Variables	54
<i>Regression Models for Tolerance</i>	55
Approach 1: Regressing According to Level of Education/Community Involvement	55
Approach 2: Regressing According to Qualities and Components.....	55
Approach 3: Regressing Combinations Variables	56
<i>Summary of Results</i>	57
Hypothesis One.....	57
Hypothesis Two	58
Hypothesis Three	59
Hypothesis Four.....	59
Hypothesis Five	63
CHAPTER 5: Discussion.....	64
<i>Friendship</i>	64
Elementary and High School Friendship	66
Faith Group Friendship	68
Friendship with Marginalized Individuals	71
<i>Education</i>	73
University vs. Total Years of Education.....	73
<i>Unexpected Findings</i>	74

Ethnic/Racial Teachers	74
High School Instruction	76
<i>Participant Feedback</i>	77
<i>Limitations</i>	79
Ethnic vs. Racial	79
Oversimplification of Issues	79
<i>Confidence</i>	81
<i>Implications and Interventions</i>	83
Friendship During Early Years	83
Policy and Funding	84
Reframing Issues and Approaches	84
<i>The Invisible and Unspoken Discussion</i>	85
Power and Privilege	85
<i>Final Thoughts</i>	91
Appendix I	93
Appendix II	95
References	100

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Correlations of Aggregate Scales with Outcome Measures	50
Table 2: Correlation Trends for Attitudes Towards Immigration	50
Table 3: Correlation Trends for Tolerance	50
Table 4: Attitudes Towards Immigration Regression Models	60
Table 5: Tolerance Regression Models.....	61

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

Canada's racial and ethnic composition has changed remarkably over the past several decades, a trend which has been under researched from a social work perspective. Apart from Australia and Israel, Canada has received more immigrants per capita than any other nation (Fortin & Loewen, 2004). Moreover, in more recent years the ethnic and racial profile of immigrants has reversed from predominantly European to non-European immigrants. For example, the proportion of immigrants from Asia, Africa and the Caribbean have increased from five percent to seventy percent since 1961, while that of European immigrants has decreased from over ninety percent to under twenty percent (Blake, 2003). Canada has formally embraced this trend through a Multicultural Policy, which expressly seeks to break down discrimination. The main points of this policy are that all Canadians are free to maintain their own cultural identities, Canadians should be willing to share their cultural identities with other Canadians, and that Canada should be free of prejudice and discrimination (Berry & Kalin, 1995).

Due to such an overt national policy, Canada and Canadians are widely recognized for openness towards newcomers of all backgrounds. Nevertheless, many newcomers face incredible challenges to integrating into Canadian life; the integration process is hard, marked with overt and subtle forms of prejudice, as well as systemic barriers to education, employment and perhaps most importantly, barriers that hinder an authentic sense of belonging to this country (Bannerji, 1996). Given this, it is not surprising how little understanding there is regarding the general public's attitudes towards newcomers, specifically those of racial and ethnic

distinction; there is a clear need for a better understanding of what shapes people's attitudes towards immigrants (Verkuyten, 2004).

Understanding attitudes towards immigrants is particularly important as research has demonstrated the relationship between self-reported attitudes and behaviour (Dovidio, et al., 1997). Negative attitudes surrounding immigrants and immigration may reflect and explain negative behaviours directed at immigrants (Sobczak, 2007). Given the magnitude of this topic, how little we know about Canadians' perceptions of immigration and more importantly, what contributes to these attitudes, there is a stark inattention to this subject – one that will continue to impact policy, education, healthcare, housing and nearly every aspect of communities, not to overlook the wellbeing of newcomers themselves. For these reasons, social work research is well prompted to consider the social influences on such attitudes.

This research addressed the question: how do social aspects of education, peer groups and community involvement relate to attitudes towards immigration and prejudice towards immigrants? The goal was to uncover tangible information about the antecedent conditions that foster inclusive attitudes, with the understanding that insight into these areas can provide direction for community leaders, school boards, faith organizations, or any social agency about how to overcome barriers to integration and make Canada a welcoming nation to newcomers.

My motivation for researching this topic stemmed from a personal experience transitioning from an anti-immigration bias to a strong supporter of immigration policy, an advocate for newcomer needs, and a personal friend to many newcomers and racialized people. Reflection on my own journey highlights the significance of

social scenarios, many of which, as I have discovered, are reflected as themes within contemporary research on immigration attitudes. Nevertheless, no recent research has directly tested the impact of these specific scenarios, despite a sound theoretical foundation for doing so. To address this shortcoming in literature, I applied a post-positivist approach to test social factors relating to inclusive attitudes; I approached this through a structured self-report survey method. This research seeks to transition the dialogue of attitudes towards immigrants and immigration in a direction that offers more tangible clues about how simple social interventions can increase the inclusiveness of Canadians towards newcomers.

CHAPTER 2: Literature Review

The dialogue surrounding attitudes towards immigration and immigrants has been marked by numerous approaches, ranging from individual dimensions, perceptions about the consequences of immigration, as well as theory surrounding the interactions between members of cultural groups. Taken together, such approaches demonstrate the breadth and intricacy of studying this topic. The following review highlights the central theoretical contributions towards understanding attitudes towards immigrants and newcomers.

Contact Theory

In response to the hatred that characterized World War II, and also given the post war migration trends, social scientists began theorizing about intercultural contact and its effects on reducing prejudice (Watson, 1947; Williams 1947, as cited in Pettigrew, 1998). In the infancy of such theorizing, researchers noted a direct relationship between the amount of contact between people of different cultures, and tolerance. For example, Williams (1964, as cited in Forbes, 2004) simply stated, “the greater the frequency of interaction, the lower the prevalence of ethnic prejudice” (p. 167-68). Contact theorists asserted that antagonistic cultures, as defined by culture, language, race, beliefs, etc., were subject to negative stereotypes but that contact between groups undermined these stereotypes and generated feelings of equality across cultures (Forbes, 2004). Subsequent research expanded on the simple contact hypothesis, to consider the variance in types of contact that took place, and the differing attitudinal outcomes. Contact theories remain a central theme of contemporary studies about immigration attitudes.

Types of Contact

Arguably the most influential contact theorist was Gordon Allport (1954), who recognized that the positive effects of contact were not functions of contact frequency in isolation. Instead, he argued that contact reduces prejudice only under certain conditions: equal group status within the situation, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and the support of authorities (Pettigrew, 1998). In this regard, Allport propelled the contact dialogue to consider the *situational conditions* within which contact occurs, not simply contact itself.

The distinction between such forms of contact has been made by scholars who differentiate between “true acquaintance contact”, which arises through voluntary and significant encounters, and “casual contact”, which is more superficial, such as merely passing someone on the street (Crawley, 2005). It is reasoned that casual contact provides no basis of interaction to challenge stereotypical perceptions and therefore cannot yield more favourable attitudes. Even more, casual contact may lead to more prejudiced attitudes and behaviours; contact occurring outside the conditions stipulated by Allport, or conditions of “true acquaintance”, may actually reinforce negative attitudes. In this regard, and in grave challenge of Williams’ (1979) hypothesis that purported a direct relationship between contact and tolerance, Allport (1979) asserted, “the more [casual] the contact, the more trouble (as cited in Crawley, 2005, p. 22).

Forbes (2004) highlighted a practical dilemma when considering policy implications; if certain types of contact clearly improve attitudes, and other types of contact clearly erode favourable attitudes, how can one ensure that occurring contact

will have positive effects rather than negative? This problem remains under-addressed in the literature to date.

A study conducted several decades ago attempted to investigate this predicament in a meaningful way. While these researchers uncovered valuable findings, my search of the literature reveals that their approach has never since been revisited. Jones & Lambert (1959-60) researched the attitudes of native Canadians towards immigrants by relating attitudes to basic characteristics of social systems. They based their research upon Taft's (1953) assertion, similar to Allport's contact theory, that social interaction and participation between natives and immigrants were critical determinants of attitudes. Jones & Lambert also acknowledged Richardson's (1957) notion that interaction itself was not sufficient to modify attitudes, but rather the *kinds* of shared participation should be examined. Jones & Lambert hypothesized that a person's attitudes towards immigrants would vary directly in relation to the *situations* within which they interacted with immigrants.

While the following research is founded on similar underpinnings as the abovementioned theorists, I wish to highlight the main point of departure which is relevant to my proposed research. Jones & Lambert applied a *systems theory* approach to examining interactions. In particular, they based their questionnaire on Parsons' theory of social systems (1951) that was a predecessor to more contemporary systems frameworks. Parsons opined that social action was structured through three facets: a social system, an individual's personality, and the cultural system (Robins et al., 2006). Using this conceptualization, Jones and Lambert found that attitudes were meaningfully influenced when contact occurred through various spheres of cooperative activity, including work, neighbourhood, social-recreational

and commercial arenas. They followed this approach given their reasoning that it “seemed more fruitful to think of social contacts between native Canadians and immigrants as occurring within *systems* of interaction and to analyze the attitude data in terms of selected *properties* of systems of interaction” (p.542). They used a measure assessing “social systems items” to assess attitudes; this included items such as, “in social clubs to which Canadians and immigrants belong, the immigrants should have the same chance as Canadians to hold responsible positions” (p. 538).

Jones and Lambert (1959-60) found that those who reported more favourable and active contact with immigrants also gave the most favourable responses to the social system items such as work, neighbourhood, club, church and school. Also, those who gave unfavourable responses reported more *involuntary* contact with immigrants; in one analysis they found that respondents with unfavourable attitudes had disproportionately more interaction in the work sphere, a system which could be considered involuntary, while subjects with more favourable responses had disproportionately more interaction in the ‘club’ sphere, an entirely voluntary system. They concluded a systematic relationship between attitude direction and the structure of *interaction systems* to which such attitudes are relevant.

Jones and Lambert conducted a subsequent study in 1967, where they again tested different spheres of social activity including, work, union, commercial, family, social-recreation, community, religion and school. Within this study they again concluded that the variation in attitudes towards immigrants significantly related dimensions within the social systems (Jones & Lambert, 1967).

I have highlighted these studies in greater detail because, to my knowledge, no other research has strategically applied contact theory from a systems perspective

that acknowledges the influence of various spheres of cooperative contact; moreover, in my literature review thus far, the abovementioned study has not, to my knowledge, been cited by contemporary researchers, although I find no critical grounds for questioning their findings. While Jones and Lambert certainly approached attitudes towards immigrants during a different demographic and socio-political context, I believe a resurrection of their systems approach can integrate the relative concepts presented in literature into meaningful research that speaks to today's demographic and socio-political composition of Canada.

Some contemporary research has hinted at the positive benefits of some social forms of interaction. For example, athletic teams have been found to be an example whereby Allport's condition of a 'common goal' can be facilitated (Chu & Griffey 1985; Miracle, 1981; Patchen, 1982 as cited in Pettigrew, 1998), because contact through interracial sports teams furthers the benefits of contact through cooperative activity towards a mutual goal (Pettigrew, 1998). Similarly, intergroup cooperation within a school setting is cited as improving race relations (Brewer & Miller 1984; Desforges et al., 1991; Johnston. et al., 1984; Schofield, 1989; Slavin, 1983; Slavin & Madden, 1979 as cited in Pettigrew, 1998).

Along similar lines, Pettigrew (1998) posited that friendship involved all of the conditions necessary for optimal intergroup contact. Through a meta-analysis study, Pettigrew & Tropp (2000) found that friendship, work and neighbourhood contact reduced prejudice under Allport's conditions for optimal contact (see Ward & Masgoret, 2006). Aberson, Shoemaker & Tomolillo's (2004) research also determined that individuals with close friends, who were members of a target group for a self-report bias measure, were less prejudice than participants without close

friends from the bias group. As such, interethnic friendship seems to be a factor in prejudice. Pettigrew (1997) states that having friends in one outgroup may increase one's openness to share contact with other outgroups and as such, the benefits of interethnic friendships may produce spin-off benefits (as cited in Bratt, 2005). Again, as friendship represents a method of interpreting types of contact, it seems logical from a social work foundation to more diligently investigate how and where these friendships are taking place, and to comprehensively replicate the above findings with respect to common attitudinal outcome measures. While Pettigrew's (1998) meta-analysis of research determined that work and neighbourhood friendships were recurring themes within the literature body, it did not test these findings within a systems theory framework.

Overall, the abovementioned research points towards the benefit of more closely examining the social determinants of immigrant attitudes. However, while individual nuggets of consideration to specific social systems exist, no comprehensive strategy has been offered in the literature to date. There is no established framework for investigating social phenomenon from a systems perspective within the context of assessing attitudes towards immigrants and newcomers. Accordingly, a more detailed rationale for a systems theory will be presented later as the theoretical underpinnings for the present research.

Ethnic Presence

Closely related to specific contact studies, Kalin (1996) investigated the impact of 'ethnic presence' within one's neighbourhood or geographic region. He conducted a national survey examining the impact of ethnic presence on comfort ratings toward

twelve ethnic/racial groups in Canada. Information regarding the ethnic presence within respondents' municipalities was attained from 1986 Census data. Through this, Kalin found a direct relationship between ethnic attitudes and ethnic presence, indicating that the greater the representation of a group in a respondent's geographic region, the more positive the respondent's attitude toward that group. In light of the abovementioned discussion on contact, Kalin's results seem to lend support for the original contact hypothesis, and contradict the notion that the type of contact is more important than the frequency or accessibility of contact that takes place. This demonstrates an area of uncertainty about the generalizability of contact theories. It supports the notion that contact with ethnic groups is a key factor in understanding attitudes, but there remains no clear understanding of this dynamic.

Kalin's findings are limited due to the demographic era at the time of his study, most importantly that there were significantly less racial migrants than today. Additionally, even Kalin relied on Census data attained ten years prior to his own research which may impact the validity of his results. Kalin identified this limitation and noted that assessing attitudes towards visible minorities may reveal different trends. He noted that his findings leave room for the possibility that attitudes toward visible minorities may be unrelated or even inversely related to their presence. These limitations, especially in light of the changing ethnic and racial composition in Canada warrants a closer look at how contact affects individuals' attitudes today.

Threat

Another major concentration of relevant literature emphasized the impact of fear and perceptions of threat on attitudes towards immigrants (Stephan, et al., 2005). Threat

has been commonly examined from an Integrated Threat Theory that identifies four major categories of threat. These include realistic threat, symbolic threat, negative stereotypes, and intergroup anxiety (Stephan et al., 1998).

Realistic threats refer to awareness of tangible threats, resulting from scarce resources, including economic assets and employment (Stephan et al., & Tur-Kapsa, 1998, as cited in Ward & Masgoret, 2006). For example, Palmer (1996) found that unemployed people had a greater tendency to believe that immigration increased unemployment, and therefore oppose population increases from immigration. He asserts that the perceived consequences of immigration mattered least to retired respondents, more to those in the labour force, and most to the unemployed, indicating a relationship between perceived individual economic consequence of immigration and attitude towards immigration. Palmer noted that threats do not need to be realized in order to impact attitudes about immigration; a perceived sense of threat is also an important factor (Fetzer, 2000). Next, symbolic threats pertain to differences in norms, beliefs and values that challenge an ingroup's worldview (Ward & Masgoret, 2006). Within Canada, Esses et al. (1993, as cited in Stephan et al., 2005) found that symbolic beliefs were related to Canadians' prejudice towards a variety of ethnic outgroups. Fortin & Loewen (2004) also noted the importance of such symbolic triggers and addressed the influence of underlying values, most likely acquired during childhood. Negative stereotypes are also conceptualized as threats (Ward & Masgoret, 2006). Stephan et al. (2005) explain that negative outgroup stereotypes lead to perceptions of threat because they create negative expectations of behaviour from the stereotyped group. And, finally, intergroup anxiety refers to the

threat that is sensed as people fear personal rejection, embarrassment, or exploitation by outgroups (Stephan et al., 2005).

With respect to threat theories and attitudes towards immigrants, Stephan, et al. (2005) found that attitudes toward an immigrant group were most negative when the group posed realistic and symbolic threats. Chandler & Tsei (2001) found that perceived cultural threats, especially threat to the English language had the most impact on perceptions on immigration. Of interesting note, however, attempts to challenge peoples' perceptions of threat have been found ineffective, and even detrimental. Some research demonstrates that people rebel against attempts to sway their views on immigration; perceived attempts to manipulate values have backfired, leading to higher levels of bias and prejudice (Esses et al., 2006). For this reason, overtly challenging people's perceptions may not be the most prudent approach for attempting to improve attitudes towards newcomers.

Threat theories were not directly investigated within the present study; however, one of the outcome measures assessing attitudes towards immigration has incorporated several items that indirectly assess perceived economic and cultural threats (Berry, 2006; Berry et al., 1977). Examples include, "If more immigrants come to Canada, there would be more unemployment", and "Immigration increases the level of crime in Canada" (Berry, 2006; Berry et al., 1977). Using this measure as a dependent variable indirectly examines the influence of threat on individual's attitudes towards immigration.

Learning, Ritual/Social Density & Cultural Knowledge

Despite the dangers of overtly trying to manipulate people's threat perceptions, learning has a recognized role in overcoming prejudiced attitudes. Pettigrew (1998) notes that "when new learning corrects negative views of the outgroup, contact should reduce prejudice" (p.70). Here, Pettigrew alludes to an interaction effect between new learning about an outgroup, and contact with that group. Bratt (2005) also asserts that increased knowledge about an outgroup frequently has a significant impact on intergroup attitudes. Case et al. (1989) refer to Cultural Knowledge as a "qualitative" pattern of daily interactions where knowledge is more than simply attaining facts, but rather represents diverse sources of experience, along with pluralistic networks of interaction. Cultural knowledge may be understood in terms of "ritual density" (Collins 1975, as cited by Case et al., 1989). Ritual density describes interactions within settings that do not encompass diverse groups and sociocultural lifestyles. For example, ritual density is high whenever one's interactions occur within settings that do not represent a variety of encounters with diverse groups and sociocultural lifestyles. Low ritual density describes diverse interactions within heterogeneous groups that broaden one's spectrum of sociocultural experiences (Case et al., 1989, p. 471).

Case et al. (1985) draw the link between ritual density and knowledge; they posit that those who are more knowledgeable are more equipped to interact under conditions of low ritual density and therefore knowledge may "reduce the likelihood of prejudice-generating over-identification with localistic ingroups" (p.472). This

may be because low ritual density provides more opportunities to expand one's worldview and attain cultural knowledge. The double bind of this scenario is that knowledge to some degree appears necessary to overcome high ritual density, but high ritual density itself is a barrier to acquiring cultural knowledge. Collins (1985, as cited in Reeves & Bylund, 1989), similarly refers to "social density" as having "profound effects on people's ideas and moral sentiments, hence, on their capacity for rational thought, bargaining, suicide, and anything else one cares to examine" (p. 226).

Related to ritual density, cultural affinity provides a hypothesis that individuals feel attached to groups that are from similar cultural backgrounds (Fortin & Loewen, 2004). Here there is a connection between qualitative learning/knowledge acquisition, exposure to heterogeneous groups, and how such factors relate to prejudice. Accordingly it makes sense to further explore how and where such learning occurs, in particular scenarios where cultural knowledge is coupled with intercultural contact.

Methodologically, it may be difficult to assess cultural knowledge, especially because it represents a qualitative pattern of learning which may or may not lend itself to articulation or quantification. For example, a school may facilitate learning in general, through instruction methods and course content, but such conditions do not necessarily translate into knowledge acquisition. For the purposes of the present study, scenarios through which cultural knowledge could reasonably be facilitated were explored in order to conduct quantitative investigations.

Education

While education is consistently shown to increase endorsement of racial equality (Case, Greeley & Fuchs, 1989; Fortin & Loewen, 2004), an adequate explanation for this finding has yet to be determined. As mentioned above, Chandler & Tsei (2001) found that perceived threat impacted peoples' attitudes towards immigration, but they also found that education had a strong impact. They state that "practically every study has identified a positive correlation between education (especially college education) and pro-immigration attitudes" (p. 186). More specifically, Chandler & Tsei found that post-secondary education had a stronger impact on attitudes than total years of education. They say that the greater tolerance associated with higher education may be a result of knowledge acquisition, more critical thinking, a greater sense of security to counteract threats, development of more sophisticated defences of their class interest, or more diverse social networks (Chandler & Tsei, 2001; Case et al., 1989). Case et al. (1989) argue that education broadens perspectives beyond those of local communities and groups and highlight the interplay between education, ritual density, knowledge and prejudice. They point to the particular contribution of post-secondary education because, in comparison, elementary school environments typically reflect the demographics of local communities, while universities "participate in the worldwide systems of cultural exchange" (p. 472). They note that as the level of education increases, ritual density decreases. Their study draws attention to the overlap in conditions that take place within educational settings and the effect these have on immigration and immigrant attitudes.

What we know clearly is that education is related to more favourable attitudes, although explanations of this trend are less clear. The consensus that education is strongly linked to more favourable attitudes is encouraging; it warrants a more specific examination to discover the impact of knowledge and contact and determine whether one or both elements are predictive of inclusive attitudes. It also begs inquiry as to whether other systems of social interaction have similar bearing on favourable attitudes. Again, this query contributes towards justifying a systems approach of examining attitudes towards ethnic and racial groups that considers the aspects of formal education, as well as comparable aspects of other social arenas.

Individual Differences

Another area of immigration literature focuses on personal dimensions, individual differences and their impact on attitudes. In this regard, Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) and Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) are most frequently cited, both of which are major predictors of prejudice (Heaven & St. Quintin, 2003). Social Dominance Orientation can be defined as “the general tendency to favour hierarchical social structures over more egalitarian ones” (Heaven & St. Quintin, 2003, p.626). Right Wing Authoritarianism, characterized by conventionalism, authoritarian submission and authoritarian aggression is a revision of the “authoritarian” or “pre-fascist” personalities (Altemeyer, 1981; Adorno et al., 1950, as cited in Heaven & St. Quintin, 2003). SDO has been found to have a predictive relationship with unfavourable attitudes towards immigrants (Esses et al., 2001). Similarly, RWA is frequently linked with intolerance, support for ethnocentric legislation, and general ethnic prejudice (Heaven & St. Quintin, 2003).

Some research has investigated how to reduce prejudicial attitudes in those who exhibit these dimensions. For example, Esses et al.,(2006) attempted to reduce unfavourable attitudes towards immigration in those with a high SDO by promoting a national ingroup including both immigrants and non-immigrants within an experimental setting. Manipulation of a common national ingroup promoted more positive attitudes towards immigrants and immigration within their Canadian sample. They reason that reducing one's preoccupation with group membership eliminated the link between higher SDO and unfavourable attitudes and they recommend that de-emphasizing social group membership reduces the need for group dominance. Along similar lines, another study found that students who reported empathizing with foreign exchange students experienced a reduction in negative attitudes towards them (Stephan et al., 2005).

While these studies provide insight into individual differences, the practical challenge becomes how to 'manipulate' individual differences in a non-experimental setting. If this approach were to be applied non-experimentally, it may prove fruitful to consider the social systems through which social group memberships can be blurred.

Summary of Criticisms and Rationale for Proposed Research Direction

Although the aforementioned studies explore theoretical aspects of immigration, they are limited in their practical application from an interventionist's viewpoint. They do not provide tangible insight into how we can improve peoples' attitudes toward newcomers. For example, contact theories provide a strong foundation with respect to an influence on shaping peoples' attitudes, but insufficient research has

comprehensively addressed the social settings within which contact occurs, or how public policy can enable increased amounts of contact. Likewise, the literature on ethnic presence addresses a shortcoming that is evident within other bodies of literature in illustrating that attitudes toward immigrants or immigration alone without consideration of visible minorities and racial factors insufficiently addresses today's demographic and socio-political context. While threat theories reveal that certain internal perceptions about the consequences of immigration, they are quite limited in their application with respect to intervention. There is ample warning that overt attempts to challenge threat perceptions are likely to reinforce, rather than overcome them. Accordingly, there seems little pragmatic value in scrutinizing them from an intervention perspective. Yet, strong support exists for the function of qualitative cultural learning, and there is sufficient reason to believe that formal education may facilitate this to some degree, in particular due to increased levels of intercultural contact that combat ritual or social density. Finally, another area which is silent within the literature about inclusive attitudes is that of societal power relations. While Social Dominance Orientation pertains to one's *personal* endorsement of hierarchical power structures (Heaven & St. Quintin, 2003), the societal outplay of power and privilege have been ignored in research to date. As the present study does not offer much to broach this omission, a more complete exploration of power and privilege will take place as a discussion of the limitations of this study in Chapter 5.

One final area of criticism pertains to the measures and instruments used in previous research assessing attitudes. Not only has there been a lack of a consistent approach in assessing attitudes towards immigration, immigrants, tolerance and

prejudice etc., but the quality of instruments used to do so are subject to criticism. For example, Victoria Esses from the University of Western Ontario and John Dovidio from Yale University are among the most published researchers in this field. Esses, Dovidio and their colleagues (Esses et al., 2001; Esses et al., 2002; Esses et al., 2006; Dovidio et al., 1997) approached numerous studies by using a single item scale to assess attitudes towards immigrations; their respondents rated from 'extremely unfavourable' to 'extremely favourable' their "general attitude towards immigrants". Within various studies they relied on this measure alone, or used it in combination with one or both of the following items: "how positive or negative towards immigrants are you?" (extremely negative to extremely positive); "should immigration to Canada be encouraged?" (rated strongly disagree to strongly agree). These items, although simple and comprehensible, are not, in my opinion, comprehensive. Asking someone how positive or negative they are seems vague, as does assessing one's "general" attitude.

Walter Stephan of New Mexico State University, another predominant researcher in this field approaches the assessments of attitudes towards immigrants by assessing respondents' feeling towards immigrants (Stephan et al., 1998; Stephan et al., 2005). He uses a 10-point scale asking respondents to indicate the degree to which they feel: hostility, admiration, dislike, acceptance, superiority, affection, disdain, approval, hatred, sympathy, rejection and warmth. Although this approach may offer more insight into the feelings experienced towards immigrants, there is no clue as to the context for these feelings.

Rudolf Kalin of Harvard University has used comfort ratings to assess attitudes towards immigrants (Kalin, 1996), and has also partnered with John Berry to

assess attitudes based on comfort ratings (Kalin & Berry, 1996). Respondents were asked to rate on a 7- point scale “how comfortable they would feel” to be around immigrants, or people from fourteen different ethnic groups. While an advantage of this approach is that it assesses attitudes towards different ethnic groups, a feature that is missing within most other research, it is difficult to ascertain what “comfort” means, and the differences held by respondents for the meaning of this scale. Also, simply assessing comfort does not provide any hints as to how their assessment of comfort would translate into attitudes that may impact specific behaviours.

Colleen Ward of Victoria University in New Zealand is also a frequently cited author (Ward & Mullander, 1991; Ward & Masgoert, 2006). She has adapted measures created by John Berry and Rudolf Kalin (Berry et al., 1977; Berry, 2006) rating attitudes on a 5-point scale three items such as “how much do you agree or disagree that we should recognize cultural and racial diversity is a fundamental characteristic of New Zealand”. While I believe the content of this approach offers much more meaningful understanding of what attitudes are being assessed, above mere “comfort” or “general attitudes”, it seems that Berry and Kalin’s measures from which Ward has adapted her instruments provide the most comprehensive approach to understanding attitudes. Berry and Kalin’s instruments incorporate several items, each assessing a specific aspect of the attitude being addressed rather than general sentiments of feelings which are ambiguous, and may not hold the same meaning between different respondents. Moreover, relying on a scale of items (11), an aggregate measure offers a more thorough exploration of one’s attitudes than a single item, or assessment relying on up to three items. Further details of Berry and Kalin’s

instruments will be provided in the Methods section as they were used to assess the outcome attitudes within the present study.

In light of this literature summary, it seems that a basis for continuing research must look for findings that can be tangibly linked to positive outcomes. An examination of specific social determinants, moreover, looking at what currently works within our social systems is the most logical point for moving forward in research, and for devising on-target interventions.

CHAPTER 3: Methodology

Paradigm and Theoretical Framework

Post-Positivism

This research was approached through a post-positivist paradigm, relying on a structured self-report, quantitative survey. Although my methodology largely reflects a positivist approach, I will briefly summarize why I reject a strict positivist research philosophy.

Quantitative research is traditionally approached through a positivist viewpoint based on the assumption that the scientific method can uncover hard facts and truths, and that the relationship between these can be systematically explored and understood (Crossan, 2003). Central to positivist philosophy is belief in an objective reality that is independent of human behaviour (Crossan, 2003). The main postulates of positivism are that it is methodological, value-free, causal, operationalized for quantitative measurement, that the researcher is independent from the subjects, and that its aims to reduce problems to their simplest elements (Crossan, 2003). While the proposed research applies similar features, a *post*-positivist paradigm more appropriately represents my research philosophy.

Post-positivism does not view reality in such rigid terms. "Reality does not exist within a vacuum, its composition is influenced by its context; and many constructions of reality are therefore possible" (Crossan, 2003, p. 52). Post-positivists recognize the relationship between an individual's actions, attitudes, external environment and socio-cultural issues (Crossan, 2003, p. 52). The dilemma between the positivist and post-positivist mindset is captured by Alexander (1990) who says:

...the simplistic choice between scientific theory and antitheoretical relativism represents not only a false dichotomy but a dangerous one. Either knowledge of the world is unrelated to the social position and intellectual interests of the knower, in which case general theory and universal knowledge is viable; or knowledge is affected by its relation to the knower, in which case relativistic and particularistic knowledge can be the only result. This is a true dilemma because it presents a choice between two equally unpalatable alternatives (p. 532)

My personal research philosophy reflects the middle-ground of the supposed positive/post-positive dichotomy. As previously mentioned, I was not value-free in my motivation to study attitudes towards newcomers. Rather, my interest in the topic stems from my realisation that significant life events have changed my attitude of one that is critical and closed to accepting immigrants from racial and ethnic minorities, to one that recognizes and values their contribution to Canada, and desires to see equal opportunity for newcomers. As such, I believe that favourable dispositions towards newcomers are desirable, and importantly, that these dispositions can be influenced through social systems. Not only my interest in this topic, but also my choice in methodology, come from my subjective experiences.

Notwithstanding this, I generally operate from a positivist epistemological lens. I acknowledge my educational influence on my “reverence” for the scientific method, and admit a bias towards it, due to my opinion that it offers the most controlled, reliable and generalizable findings. My ontological assumption is that there are causal effects on our attitudes and behaviours; my approach to practice is influenced by my belief that individual and group attitudes and behaviour can be influenced given an understanding of antecedent conditions for attitude and behaviour. When I consider my unique “pathway” to valuing diversity, the positivist

inside me reasons, that others who share my values have likely encountered some/many of the same elements that I have to foster their similar values/attitudes. In this sense, I perceive a sort of “aggregate truth” when considering people’s subjective experiences en-mass. For this reason, my lens is *post*-positivist, rather than strictly a positivist one.

I was also influenced towards a post-positivist approach because my academic and employment interests lean strongly toward macro-level and policy understanding and influence on social issues. I am interested in issues of widespread significance, in particular, for policymakers and gatekeepers of resources within the community. As such, I was looking for the opportunity to gather significant quantities of data that can yield comprehensive and generalizable results. This is in part due to my understanding that policy is often influenced only when weighty numbers are attached as evidence for theories.

Quantitative Research

In keeping with a post-positivist paradigm, and my desire to generate a large sample of generalizable and statistically significant results, I used a quantitative approach as this is the most appropriate means of attaining these goals (Rubin & Babbie, 2007). Moreover, in light of the sensitive research topic, I believe that maintaining anonymity through an arm’s length distance to research participants contributes towards attainment of honest responses. Neuman & Kreuger (2003) note that for sensitive issues that may cause shame or embarrassment when responding, an anonymous survey method facilitates the most honest responses, as respondents do not feel as pressured to distort their true responses through social desirability bias.

Also, as previously mentioned, I was interested in uncovering findings that could be useful at a social policy intervention level. While the richness of data that could be provided through qualitative methods is lacking through this approach, the weight of statistical values should add credibility to my findings (Rubin & Babbie, 2007), at least when considering positivist gatekeepers for change. On a final note, the *post* aspect of my post-positive approach speaks to the incorporation of a subjective and qualitative foundation to the construction of my research instrument; both my own qualitative experiences, and those arising from consultation with my peers have been incorporated into my survey and methodology.

Systems Theory

Systems theory and its numerous interdisciplinary variations most simply pertain to the examination of an individual's reciprocal relationship with their environment (Boulding, 1956; Robbins et al., 1997; Saleeby, 2001), or their ecology. Ecology is defined as "relationship between the organism and its environment....and for a social ecology, social relations" (Seidman, 1988, p.8). The difficulties in applying systems theory have been well documented over several decades; accordingly, the systems group of theories has evolved in response to criticisms and challenges, and has come to variant theories such as structural functionalism, ecological perspectives, dynamic systems theories, deep ecology and ecofeminism (Robbins et al., 1997).

In simple summary, here are some prevailing criticisms of systems theories in general. Because a systems perspective crosses boundaries of biology, botany, engineering, anthropology and sociology (Saleeby, 2001) the theory has been considered too vast and expansive to be meaningfully applied (Boulding, 1956);

systems theory addresses the complex and often untidy intricacies of human habitat, and aims to understand the influence these innumerable factors have on individual, group, societal and environmental levels. Systems theory has been criticised for its conservative nature and its underlying assumption that overarching systems are self-maintaining and self-correcting. Accordingly, there has been an overemphasis on the individual's need to adapt to their environment, rather than to identify and challenge environmental stressors and sources of injustice (Robbins et al., 1997; Saleebey, 2001). Hand in hand with this failing, is the overemphasis on individuals altogether, when applying systems approaches. Saleebey (2001) notes that systems theory is "heavily weighted to understanding individuals, the sources of their adaptability and coping, and their ego development as it unfolds...by comparison, the discussion of environments – social, built, and physical – is thin" (p. 215).

While this is in fact a valid critique of systems theories, I view it as mandate to seek more appropriate applications of a theory that I believe has much to offer, especially from a macro-social perspective. Forder (1976) specifically advocates the use of systems theory in social work practice because it recognizes the multiplicity of systems at their varying levels of complexity that influence any given situation, in turn, this makes it possible to consider a wider range of interventions.

In light of the vastness of systems approaches, I highlight Boulding's (1956) assertion that systems theories may be applied with varying degrees of ambition and confidence, but that ignoring systems altogether is detrimental to science. "The more science breaks into sub-groups, and the less communication is possible among the disciplines, however, the greater chance there is that the total growth of knowledge is being slowed down by the loss of relevant communications" (Boulding, 1956, p.

198). Within the context of the present research study, the stovepipe investigations pertaining to multiculturalism, diversity, education, recreation etc., are long overdue to be considered comprehensively, at least to some degree of “ambition and confidence” from a framework that acknowledges the influence of human ecology, even if only to combat the atrophy of “relevant communications.”

Moreover, as the following section will highlight, application of systems theory within the context of addressing the barriers faced by newcomers, moves away from the conservative, individual-focused and socially complacent reputations of its predecessors. While my approach to systems is not entirely in line with a deep ecology perspective that emphasizes personal ecological awareness and relationship with nature, nor do I align with an ecofeminism view that is perhaps more focused on power imbalances on a gender plain (Robbins, et al., 1997). However, I do take from these variations a consideration of the power and injustice issues related to the present research, which leads me to touch on anti-oppressive philosophies.

Anti-Oppressive Consciousness

Oppression refers to how “life chances are constructed, and as the process by which this state of affairs is created and maintained...oppression is the presumption in favour of men, white people, and other dominant groups, which skews all social relationships and is encoded in their very structure” (Ward & Mullender, 1991, p. 22). According to my research which intently recognizes and objects to the restriction of “life chances” for immigrants and ethnic/racial minorities, I would be remiss not to mention oppression, and some theoretical and philosophical considerations that come with the territory. Oppression is characterized by relations of domination and

subordination (Ward & Mullender, 1991) and as such, clearly represents a disempowerment of those who are being dominated and subordinated. Oppression is not an isolated action by one individual upon another. Rather, oppression is enabled and ensured by society's institutions (Ward & Mullender, 1991). As social workers, the term "empowerment" is littered within our conversations and material resources. Although empowerment is most often discussed from an individual's perspective, any conceptualization of empowerment that fails to recognize social power at individual, organizational and community levels fails to consider some of the most likely means of intervention in order to combat power imbalance (Speer & Hughey, 1995). In this light, anti-oppressive activity warrants ecological considerations, and therefore, a systems approach as outlined in the present study.

I am cognisant that my positivist approach symbolizes some of the dominant traditions which have supported, and which currently maintain power structures that support white, educated, male privilege. Strier (2007) notes that "any intervention or research project, regardless of the benevolent and progressive nature of its goals and intentions, may replicate the structural conditions that generate oppression" (p. 859). In this regard, although I certainly aimed to develop knowledge that challenges oppression, I recognize that my choice in methodology, to some degree may be seen to reinforce the traditions I aim to break. At a minimum, I want to be transparent in this regard. However, in keeping with anti-oppressive social work research, social change is central to my research agenda (Strier, 2007). And while I am not an ethnic or racial minority myself, and do not pretend to understand their experiences, I align myself in their struggle for equality, which is very much reflective of an anti-oppressive stance. The anti-racist struggle is just as much the responsibility of white

practitioners as it is of blacks (Dominelli, 1988). Overall, this project is inspired by a desire to redress oppression and supports an anti-oppressive stance.

Research Overview

My research aimed to transition research surrounding immigration from theoretical discourses to the search for direct links between social aspects of Canadian life and how we view immigrants. The purpose was to determine whether certain social factors emerge as statistically related or even predictive of favourable attitudes towards newcomers. Because research indicates that self-reported attitudes lead to behaviour, the prevalence of negative attitudes surrounding immigration may reflect a prevalence of negative behaviours directed towards immigrants as well (Sobczak, 2007); for this reason, a greater understanding of what influences inclusive attitudes can provide greater insight into intervention possibilities. The pragmatic value was in identifying means of increasing aspects of community life which are likely to promote inclusive attitudes. The findings of this study are intended to provide insight for policy makers, educators, and community groups in terms of methods to strategically develop and encourage mechanisms within society that are likely to foster support for immigration, or counteract negative dispositions regarding immigration.

My thesis explores the general question:

How do social aspects of education, peer groups and community involvement relate to attitudes towards immigration and prejudice towards immigrants?

Specific research hypotheses will be stated following an overview of the design and research variables.

Design

This research was enabled by an internet hosted, self-report, anonymous, structured survey addressing social antecedent conditions and attitudes towards immigration, immigrants, diversity and overt prejudice. An internet based survey allowed for easy, quick and widespread distribution, in keeping with my goal to attain sufficient responses to generalize findings (Rubin & Babbie, 2007). Additionally, such a method reduced both cost (Rubin & Babbie, 2007), and the environmental burden of paper and pencil mail surveys. With respect to response accuracy, an online survey allowed for built in checking control, as a participants responded to items; for example, respondents were not be able to accidentally miss questions, or incorrectly follow skip sequences. An internet survey method also allowed an option for maintaining anonymity; upon completion of the survey, participants were redirected to another survey where they could enter their contact information if they wished to be included in the prize draw. Whereas with paper and pencil methods, inviting respondents to participate in a draw would have necessitated sending a separate response slip and prepaid return envelope, this method again eliminated the cost and paper; it also prevented respondents from simply returning the prize slip without actually completing a survey.

Use of a survey design is consistent with a post-positivist approach, as surveys have an inherent statistical nature (Neuman & Kreuger, 2003). In light of the research questions and hypotheses being tested, use of a survey method allows many variables to be measured, multiple hypotheses to be tested, and statistical inferences to be made about the relationship between variables (Neuman & Kreuger, 2003). As

I was specifically seeking to explore predictive relationships between my independent variables (social scenarios, including contact, knowledge etc.) and my dependent variables (attitudes), a survey design enabled this investigation.

This design has several limitations. First, participation was restricted to those with internet access, and thus a response bias based on social status may be reflected in the results. Second, participation is limited to those who are computer literate. Rubin & Babbie (2007) note that online survey respondents are biased towards younger and more highly educated populations. In fact, the “Participants” section of this report presents demographic information verifying that survey participants predominantly included individuals reporting a college or university level education.; this indicates an education bias within this sample. Finally, with an internet hosted survey, there is no way to determine the response rate, and therefore to detect other unexpected sources of response bias. While Rubin & Babbie (2007) indicate that a response rate of 50 percent is generally considered sufficient, they note that this is only a “rough guideline”.

Variables

The following section outlines variables that were explored within this study.

Demographic: Age, sex, country of origin/length of residency in Canada and level of education were assessed. These variables were captured to gain information about the respondents and to understand how likely they represent the Canadian population. These variables were not used within the statistical analysis, but were solely explored to speak to the study’s generalizability.

Antecedent/Independent Variables:

Elementary School (ES): This variable is an aggregate score of responses to all of the questions pertaining to elementary school education. It is a scale measure of the presence of teachers from a variety of racial/ethnic backgrounds, instruction about different countries and cultures, participation in cross-cultural experiences, casual contact/friendship with diverse groups, including individuals from marginalized groups.

High School (HS): This variable is an aggregate score of responses to all of the questions pertaining to high school education. It is a scale measure of the presence teachers from a variety of racial/ethnic backgrounds, instruction about different countries and cultures, participation in cross-cultural experiences, casual contact/friendship with diverse groups, participation in a voluntary exchange program, and incorporation of foreign literature and film material.

College (C): This variable is an aggregate score of responses to all of the questions pertaining to college education. It is a scale measure of the presence teachers from a variety of racial/ethnic backgrounds, instruction about different countries and cultures, participation in cross-cultural experiences, casual contact/friendship with diverse groups, participation in a voluntary exchange program, and incorporation of foreign literature and film material.

University (U): This variable is an aggregate score of responses to all of the questions pertaining to university education. It is a scale measure of the presence teachers from a variety of racial/ethnic backgrounds, instruction about different

countries and cultures, participation in cross-cultural experiences, casual contact/friendship with diverse groups, participation in a voluntary exchange program, and incorporation of foreign literature and film material.

Faith Group (FG): This variable is an aggregate score of responses to all of the questions pertaining to faith group participation. It is a scale measure of the casual friendship with ethnically and racially diverse individuals, as well as individuals representing other marginalized groups.

Volunteer Group (VG): This variable is an aggregate score of responses to all of the questions pertaining to faith group participation. It is a scale measure of the casual friendship with ethnically and racially diverse individuals, as well as individuals representing other marginalized groups.

Total Years of Education (TY): This variable represents the total reported years of formal education.

Ethnic/Racial Teachers (ERT): This variable is an aggregate score of the reported representation of different racial and ethnic teachers during elementary school, high school, college and university levels of education.

Instruction (INS): This variable is an aggregate score of the reported degree of instruction about different countries and cultures during elementary school, high school, college and university levels of education.

Experiences (EXP): This variable is an aggregate score of the reported participation in cross-cultural experiences, such as multicultural celebrations, guest speakers from

other countries/cultures and field trips to cultural locations during elementary school, high school, college and university levels of education.

Foreign Materials (FM): This variable is an aggregate score of literature or film material from foreign authors or producers during their high school, college and university levels of education.

Exchange (EXCH): This variable is an aggregate score of the reported participation in voluntary exchange programs to another country during high school, college and university.

Friendship (FR): This variable is an aggregate score of the reported amount of personal friends the respondent had with different ethnic/racial groups throughout elementary school, high school, college, university, faith group and volunteer participation. This variable was recoded to control for the reported availability of diverse individuals with whom one could make friends.

Friendship With Marginalized Person (FRM): This variable is an aggregate score of the reported amount of personal friends the respondent had that belonged to a marginalized group such as disabled or homosexual throughout elementary school, high school, college, university, faith group and volunteer participation.

Casual Contact (CC): This variable is an aggregate score of the reported presence of ethnic/racial groups within their elementary school, high school, college, university, faith group and volunteer group, as a function of reported friendship in these systems. Casual contact assessed scenarios where friendships were not formed with

ethnically/racially diverse friends, despite reported presence of ethnically/racially different groups.

Outcome/Dependent Variables:

Attitude Towards Immigration (AI): This scale consisted of 11 items that assess the perceived consequences of immigration, number of immigrants (Berry & Kalin, 1995; Berry et al., 1977). Further details of this measure can be found in the section detailing the measure used within this study.

Tolerance/Prejudice: This scale included 11 items that assessed overt endorsement of prejudice items, or tolerance items (Berry & Kalin, 1995). More specifically, it assessed one's openness and acceptance of individuals and groups that are culturally and racially different from oneself (Berry & Kalin, 1995). Further details of this measure can be found in the section detailing the measure used within this study.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. Elementary School (ES), High School (HS), College (C), University (U), Faith Group (FG) and Volunteer Group (FG) will be positively related with favourable Attitudes Toward Immigration (AI) and Tolerance (T), as explored through correlation and regression tests.

Hypothesis 2. University (U) will have the strongest relationship with favourable Attitudes Toward Immigration (AI) and Tolerance (T), as explored through correlation and regression tests.

Hypothesis 3. Total Years of Education (TYE) will be positively related to favourable Attitudes Toward Immigration (AI) and Tolerance (T), as explored through correlation and regression tests.

Hypothesis 4. Ethnic/Racial Teachers (ERT), Instruction (I), Experience (EXP), Foreign Material (FM), Exchange (EXCH), Friendship and Friendship with Marginalized Groups will be positively related with favourable Attitudes Toward Immigration (AI) and Tolerance (T), as explored through correlation and regression tests.

Hypothesis 5. Casual Contact (CC) will be negatively related with favourable Attitudes Toward Immigration (AI) and Tolerance (T), as explored through correlation and regression tests.

Procedure

Overview

As detailed above, a self-report, anonymous, internet-hosted survey was used to assess respondents' Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance, both of which were used as dependent variables within this study. Participants also responded to questions assessing the quality and content of their previous educational experiences and current community experiences.

Ethics

This study was characterized by several features that ensured the ethical treatment of participants.

Optional Participation. Participation in this project was entirely optional.

Individuals were free to participate or refuse as they wished. Moreover, because the survey was internet hosted, individuals who were invited to participate (through email, or word of mouth) did not have to decline face to face, or at all for that matter, if they did not want to participate. In this sense, there was no peer pressure placed on individuals.

Background Information/Informed Consent. Appendix I outlines an introductory letter (cover letter), which was displayed on the website prior to survey administration. Within this letter I am personally identified by name, along with my academic institution, and my general purposes in soliciting participation. Participants were not kept in the dark with respect to who I am, and what I was researching. Additionally, the introductory letter clearly outlined that while participation is voluntary, completion of the survey implied consent for their data to be analyzed. Prior to beginning the survey, respondents needed to answer 'yes' to the following statement: "I have read and understand the above information. I am 16 years of age or older and I agree to participate in this study." Respondents who did not select 'yes' were automatically linked to the prize draw entry form without being able to access the research questions.

Complete Anonymity. The introductory letter provided honest assurance that survey results would be completely anonymous. By linking respondents to a separate web survey in order to input their personal information for the prize draw, respondents were assured that their personal information would not be paired with their survey responses. Participants were also informed that no individual response sets would be

analyzed or presented within research publication, but that their data would only be explored in aggregation with all participants' responses.

Ability to Opt Out/Discontinue. At any point during completion of the survey, a participant could exit the web page if they no longer wished to participate. Only completed surveys were entered for analysis, so individuals could change their mind at any point prior to submitting the final survey. Participants were instructed within the introductory letter to click the 'Exit this Survey' link if they wished to discontinue their participation; they were informed that they were still eligible to participate in the prize draw, and the link redirected them to the entry form.

Participant Attainment of Results. The information letter provided my email address, and participants were invited to request a copy of the final report.

Data Storage. Survey data will be kept for at least 5 years post-publication in electronic format. Data may be shared with other competent professionals. The data contains no sensitive information as the questionnaire was anonymous; therefore it is not required for data to be stored in a locked cabinet.

Compensation

All participants were invited to participate in a draw to win one of 5 \$50 cash prizes; upon completing the survey, participants were directed to another web link where they could complete a private prize draw entry form. Participants were assured that their responses would in no way be paired with their personal information. Participants who chose not to complete the survey, or who withdrew prior to

completion were also invited to participate in the prize draw. Prize draw entries were numbered, and once the survey link was deactivated, an online random number generator was used to generate five random numbers between 1 and 573 (the number of prize draw entries); the names that corresponded to each of the five random numbers were the prize recipients. Winners were notified in March, 2008, and after verifying correct mailing addresses, cheques were mailed to each winner.

Sampling

Individuals were invited to participate based on a four pronged snowball sampling method (Neuman & Kreuger, 2003). The first approach was to distribute the survey link to students within the Laurier Faculty of Social work; students were then asked to circulate the link to their family, friends and workmates if they were willing to do so. The second distribution approach was to forward the link to professors within other Laurier Social Science faculties, such as psychology; professors were asked to distribute the link to their students. The third distribution approach was through my undergraduate university professors and peers, current friends, family, employment, community group, and through social utilities such as Facebook. As part of this strategy, ethical approval was attained within another academic institution, undergraduate university, and the survey link was provided to all faculty, staff and students at this school.

Participants

Because this research sought to explore the attitudes of Canadians in as generalizable an approach as possible, the research population was broad and included a cross-section of Canadians, limited to those who are sixteen years of age

and Canadian citizens or permanent residents. Formal Canadian citizenship was not required for participation. There were no other overt restrictions on the research population; however, given the procedure and measure, only individuals with functional English language ability were able to participate, as well as those with internet access and computer literacy. Additionally, because the sampling strategy relied largely on university students and professors as the targets for the project, and mechanisms of recruiting others, the participant views may not be representative of the overall population.

In total, 801 surveys were accessed or started (this includes individuals who accessed the link to view the survey, but who did not input any responses). Of these, 672 response sets were acceptably completed for use in the analysis. Respondents ranged in age from 17 to 81 and the mean age was 29 years. 52% of the respondents were female and 48% were male. The majority of respondents were born in Canada. 17% reported being born in a country other than Canada. Of the respondents born overseas, the length of time living in Canada ranged from 2 to 26 years with the mean length of residency being 22 years. As mentioned above, the sample researched is likely biased based on highest level of education, as 39% of respondents indicated attending at least one level of college and 81% reported attending university for at least one year; accordingly, the overall findings may not reflect the experiences of a general Canadian population.

Measure

A unique instrument was constructed for use within this study (see Appendix II). The first portion of the measure assessed two outcome measures, Attitude

Towards Immigration and Tolerance/Prejudice. Attitudes Towards Immigration was measured by a scale consisting of 11 items that assess the perceived consequences of immigration, number of immigrants (Berry et al., 1977; Berry, 2006); these factors incorporate the influence of threat on individuals' attitudes. Respondent were asked to indicate on a 7-point Likert scale, the degree to which they agree with statements such as, "Immigration tends to threaten Canadian culture", and "Immigration increases social unrest here". Nine of eleven items were phrased according to negative effects of immigration, while the remaining three are phrased positively, such as "I feel secure when I am with people of different ethnic backgrounds." Negatively framed items were reverse scored prior to data analysis.

Tolerance/Prejudice was measured by a scale including 11 items that assess overt endorsement of prejudice items, or tolerance items (Berry et al., 1977; Berry, 2006). Because this research sought to examine inclusive attitudes, analysis and discussion purposes refer to Tolerance as the positive form of this measure. This scale assessed one's openness and acceptance of individuals and groups that are culturally and racially different from oneself (Berry et al., 1977; Berry, 2006). Five items were phrased positively and reflect tolerance, including "It is important that we treat other countries as equals", and "we should promote equality among all groups, regardless of racial or ethnic origin." Six items were phrased negatively, including "It is a bad idea for people of different races/ethnicities to marry one another." The prejudice items were reverse scored prior to analysis.

Both the Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance/Prejudice scales were used with permission by Dr. John Berry, who has extensively used the instruments, and who at this time is using the current version of these measures in the Mutual

Intercultural Relations in Plural Societies project. Both measures were slightly amended from their original form as a 5-point Likert scale to a 7-point Likert scale because research suggests that scales with too few options causes participants to squeeze their responses in order to fit Likert options, and that this can cause false increases or decreases in regression size effects (Russell et al., 1991).

Again, as previously discussed, Berry and Kalin's measures were chosen because they have been used in previous research, and by comparison within my assessment of the other approaches used to assess attitudes, these measures most clearly identify what is being assessed, and go about assessment in a comprehensive and meaningful method.

In addition to the instruments adapted from Berry and Kalin, the survey also assessed various antecedent measures that were uniquely constructed in response to a comprehensive evaluation of the literature surrounding attitudes towards immigrants. The various social arenas reflect a systems theory approach to understanding how and where meaningful cultural knowledge can be attained, and intercultural interactions may take place. These measures reflect the difference noted between true acquaintance contact between ethnic/racial groups versus casual contact (teacher instruction and friendship, versus mere presence of ethnic/racial groups). Some questions also probed hypothetical scenarios where learning may contribute to inclusive attitudes (instruction, experiences, exchanges, foreign material). Levels of education from elementary school through to university were examined given the strong and consistent finding that education is directly related to inclusive attitudes, as well as the common sense conjecture that developing youth within Canada spend a significant portion of their time within the school system, and as such it is likely that

attitudes are largely shaped by interactions within this context. Casual contact assessed scenarios where friendships were not formed with ethnically/racially diverse friends, despite reported presence of ethnically/racially different groups. A unique measure of friendship with marginalized groups was also included given research suggesting that contact with one out-group may influence attitudes towards other out-groups (Bratt, 2005). Bratt (2005) reasserts Pettigrew's (1997) view that "favourable experiences with friends in one out-group might increase the willingness to develop inter-group friendship even with other ethnic out-groups, proving spin-off effects from contact with the first out-group" (p. 463). Accordingly, this project explored whether such rationale extends beyond consideration of ethnic and racial out-groups to include other marginalized populations based on sexual orientation, ability and/or socioeconomic status.

A pilot study was conducted with 15 anonymous participants from the Faculty of Social Work to test the reliability and validity of the survey. Validity feedback was sought on question context, clarity and interpretation of wording, juxtaposition of items that may bias measurement, potential offensiveness of items, structural flaws, and time required to complete the questionnaire (Yegidis & Weinbach, 1996). The survey was adapted accordingly. Pilot participants also provided advice about ensuring inclusive language throughout the instrument. Also, both outcome measures were assessed as scales, and a Cronbach Alpha tests demonstrated adequate reliability for data analysis (further details are included within the Chapter 3 section on Data Analysis).

Finally, while the appended instrument is formatted for submission as a part of this thesis, the internet based survey include skip sequencing as necessary to ensure

accurate information was attained in a user-friendly fashion. For example, prior to entering into questions for each level of education, respondents were first asked whether they participated in that level (high school, college, university etc.) for at least one year. If they indicated 'no', for college, for example, they were automatically linked to the following section without an opportunity to accidentally complete an irrelevant section. This was intended to promote more accurate responses in a more timely manner. Skip logic was also used to ensure that valid inputs were entered within each section.

Data Analysis

After an adequate number of participants had completed the online survey, the link was deactivated in order to proceed with data analysis. All of the response sets were downloaded from my Surveymonkey.com account and exported into an SPSS file. A feature within Surveymonkey.com was used to translate Likert scale responses into numerical data points prior to exporting the file. Next, the data sets were reviewed for completeness and for any suspicious response patterns (such as inputting the same response for each question etc.). Cases with questionable patterns were deleted from the active spreadsheet. Descriptive statistics and frequencies were run in order to identify values that were outside the accepted range or did not make sense for self-report questions (i.e. indicating 20 years attendance at elementary school). An examination of outliers enabled entire cases to be examined. Responses that were clearly inaccurate were omitted. A very small number of outliers were considered 'true' and therefore included within the analysis. Missing variables within the data set were then treated by replacing the data value with the 'neutral' numeric

response for those cases where a value was necessary in order to compute aggregate variables. Items that were negatively phrased on the survey were recoded into the appropriate reverse scale, and the Friendship/Casual Contact items were computed based on the input variables. Aggregate scales were next created for each level of education and community involvement, as well as for the qualities/components of each system. The data was examined to ensure it satisfied the assumptions for proceeding with parametric tests. As expected, given the large sample, histograms illustrated near normality for the variables being examined; both outcome measures demonstrated similar mean, median and mode values. Skewness and Kurtosis values were well within acceptable ranges. Tests of reliability were conducted for both outcome scales to ensure their internal consistency. Attitudes Towards Immigration had an alpha Cronbach coefficient of .877 while Tolerance had .844, both indicating above adequate reliability for correlation and regression tests. Correlation tests were conducted in order to explore relationships between the independent and dependent variables, first based on aggregates of level of education/community involvement and next, by quality/components of these experiences. To further explore whether any factors had predictive relationships with the outcome variables, and also, to assess the degree of variance accounted for in these methods of exploration, regression tests were performed. The assumptions for regression testing were likewise met. The Durbin Watson values lied within the range of 1.5 to 2.5 therefore fulfilled expectations of independence, the Variance Inflation/Tolerance values revealed no concerns of multicollinearity between variables, and an examination of the standardized residuals revealed normal distribution and homogeneity of variance around the mean. The findings of this analysis will now be presented.

CHAPTER 4: Findings

Correlational Analyses

Aggregate Correlations

Pearson correlations were performed for each of the dependent outcomes, Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance, along with aggregate scales for each area of education and community involvement (i.e. elementary school, university, faith groups), as well as aggregate scales for each of the qualities/components of these experiences (i.e. friendship, ethnic/racial teachers, instruction). Table 1 displays the correlation coefficients for these relationships.

When examining the educational aggregates, College and University display the most significant relationships ($p < .01$) with both outcome variables. College has correlation coefficients for Attitudes Towards Immigration of .161 ($p < .001$) and Tolerance of .156 ($p < .001$), while University shows .183 ($p < .001$) and .201 ($p < .001$) respectively for these outcomes. These values contrast with the non-significant Elementary and High School coefficients, indicating that post-secondary education seems significantly related to inclusive attitudes.

Also note, however, that both community aggregates, Volunteer Group and Faith Group, are also significantly correlated to the outcomes. Volunteer Group is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level for each outcome, however with relatively small coefficients, .087 ($p = .024$) and .091 ($p = .018$) for Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance respectively. Faith Group shows both stronger and more significant correlations .152 ($p < .001$) for Attitudes Towards Immigration and .144 ($p < .001$) for

Tolerance, indicating relationships in comparable strength to what is observed for the College level of education.

The strongest relationship for Attitudes Towards Immigration was found when correlating with Total Years of Education ($r = .235, p < .001$). Total Years of Education also had a significant correlation with Tolerance ($r = .162, p < .001$), however not as strong as the relationship with University.

Three quality/component aggregates, Ethnic/Racial Teachers, Instruction and Foreign Material were not significantly correlated with either outcome variable. Experiences was correlated with Attitudes Towards Immigration ($r = .110, p = .004$), however not with Tolerance. Similarly, Exchange was less significantly correlated with Attitudes Towards Immigration ($r = .098, p = .011$), but again, not correlated with Tolerance.

The most significant relationships were found with Friendship and Casual Contact, as well as Friendship Marginalized aggregates. As Friendship and Casual Contact represent inverses of the same relationship, that is one's reported friendship with people of different ethnic/racial backgrounds, measured as a function of their opportunity to create such friendships due to the presence of peers from ethnic/racial backgrounds other than their own. Friendship and Casual Contact are correlated with Attitudes Towards Immigration ($r = .210, p < .001$), with Casual Contact displaying a negative relationship, opposite to Friendship. Similarly, these variables correlate with Tolerance ($r = .212, p < .001$), again Friendship showing a positive relationship and a negative relationship for Casual Contact.

When looking at the correlations presented in Table 1, it appears that Elementary School and High School experiences on the whole are not significantly

related to the outcome variables, while College and University are. It is also possible, that while on an aggregated level, earlier years of education do not significantly relate to inclusive attitudes, yet within these levels, discrete qualities/components are in fact significant. To more thoroughly explore the trends in correlations for each outcome variable, the individual qualities/components for each level of education will be examined for patterns. Table 2 displays the correlation coefficients for these items with Attitudes Towards Immigration.

Correlation Trends for Attitudes Towards Immigration

For Ethnic/Racial teachers, there are no significant correlations at any level of education, an anticipated pattern since the Ethnic/Racial Teacher aggregate was not significant. However, while Instruction as an aggregate was not significantly correlated with either outcome, we see that at the College and University levels, Instruction is in fact correlated with Attitudes Towards Immigration; College had a correlation coefficient of .110 ($p=.004$) and University had a coefficient of .147 ($p<.001$). On an aggregate level, these relationships seem to be offset by the negative, yet not statistically significant relationships seen for instruction at the Elementary School and High School level. For Experiences, there are significant relationships at the College ($r = .143, p<.001$) and University ($r = .168, p<.001$) level again, yet not at Elementary School and High School levels. A similar, but less significant pattern is observed for Foreign Material, which is significant for College ($r=.081, p=.036$) and University ($r = .092, p = .017$), but not for High School (foreign material was not

assessed at the elementary school level). For Exchange, University was the only significant level correlated with Attitudes Towards Immigration ($r = .111$, $p = .004$).

The most prominent effects can be seen when examining Friendship and Friendship with individuals from Marginalized groups across levels of education. For Friendship Marginalized, there is a significant relationship with Attitudes Towards Immigration at every level of education as well as Faith Group and Volunteer Group settings. The trend increases from Elementary School ($r = .093$, $p = .105$), to High School ($r = .120$, $p = .002$), College ($r = .166$, $p < .001$) and University ($r = .219$, $p < .001$). Faith Group is also significantly correlated ($r = .123$, $p = .001$) and Volunteer Group is also correlated, but to a weaker and less significant level ($r = .079$, $p = .042$).

What stands out most within Table 2 is the relationships for Friendship, which demonstrates a remarkable reversal in the trend seen with the other variables. This reverse trend warrants emphasis. Here, instead of seeing the strongest relationships at the College and University levels, the strongest correlations occur at High School ($r = .181$, $p < .001$) and Elementary School ($r = .175$, $p < .001$), while College and University show no significant relationship. Volunteer Group is also not significantly related, however Faith Group is, but to a lesser degree than the earlier years of education ($r = .121$, $p = .002$). Friendship clearly departs from the trend observed with the other quality/component variables.

Table 1. Correlations of aggregate scales with outcome measures

	AI	T	ES	HS	C	U	FG	VG	CC	TYE	ERT	INS	EXP	FM	EXCH	FR	FRM
AI	(.877)	.751**	.046	.060	.161**	.183**	.152**	.087*	(-.210**)	.235**	.024	.045	.110**	.047	.098*	.210**	.209**
T		(.844)	.006	.036	.156**	.201**	.144**	.091*	(-.212**)	.162**	(-.02)	.025	0.076	.054	.054	.212**	.229**
Mean	58.55	62.82	20.05	20.05	28.00	30.41	10.46	10.88	79.69	17.11	15.01	18.05	15.89	12.49	3.19	40.30	21.64
S.D	12.34	10.86	5.63	5.63	5.61	6.88	1.61	1.20	3.94	4.59	4.60	4.41	5.08	3.59	.46	3.94	6.28

Note 1: Exact p-values are reported within the Chapter 4. text

N= 672

Note 2: Cronbach Alpha Coefficients indicated in parentheses for dependent variables

* Correlation significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 2. Correlation trends for Attitudes Towards Immigration

	ERT	INS	EXP	FM	EXCH	FR	FRM
ES	.000	(-.044)	(-.039)			.175**	.093*
HS	.023	(-.068)	.057	(-.058)	.029	.181**	.120**
C	0.06	.110**	.143**	.081*	.040	.046	.166**
U	(-.014)	.147**	.168**	.092*	.111*	.071	.219**
FG						.121**	.123**
U						.041	.079*

AI – Attitude Towards Immigration
T – Tolerance
ES – Elementary School
HS – High School
C – College
U – University
FG – Faith Group
VG – Volunteer Group
CC – Casual Contact
TYE – Total Years of Education
ERT – Ethnic/Racial Teachers
INS – Instruction
EXP – Experiences
FM – Foreign Material
EXCH – Exchange
FR – Friendship
FRM – Friendship Marginalized

Table 3. Correlation trends for Tolerance

	ERT	INS	EXP	FM	EXCH	FR	FRM
ES	(-.032)	(-.100**)	(-.091*)			.218**	.088*
HS	(-.016)	(-.089*)	(-.008)	(-.083*)	.001	.226**	.146**
C	.042	.110**	.159**	.079*	.014	.031	.164**
U	(-.040)	.181**	.194**	.137**	.080*	.025	.252**
FG						.095*	.127**
VG						.030	.090*

Correlation Trends for Tolerance

The same approach was taken for examining Tolerance, with the correlation coefficients presented in Table 3. When observing the trend of relationships for tolerance, there is the same general pattern as with Attitudes Towards Immigration. Again, no significant correlations are seen for Ethnic/Racial teachers. For Instruction, we see the same increasing strength from College ($r = .110$, $p = .004$) to University ($r = .181$, $p < .001$), and negative relationships for Elementary School ($r = -.100$, $p = .010$) and High School ($r = -.089$, $p = .021$), however for Tolerance, these negative effects are statistically significant. Experience shows a mild negative relationship at the Elementary School level ($r = -.091$, $p = .018$), and a non-significant effect at High school, but a relationship that strengthens from College ($r = .159$, $p < .001$) to University settings ($r = .194$, $p < .001$). Again, it appears that the negative relationships in earlier levels of education offset the significance in the aggregate correlation which yielded insignificant r values. For Foreign Material, most levels show weak significant effects at $p < .05$, where High School's is slightly negative ($r = -.083$, $p = .032$) and College shows a slightly positive relationships ($r = .079$, $p = .041$); of note, University clearly shows a stronger and more significant relationship ($r = .137$, $p < .001$). Again, Exchange is only significant at the University level ($r = .080$, $p = .040$). Friendship Marginalized is again significant across all levels, including Faith Group and Volunteer Group. The strongest relationships are seen at the College ($r = .164$, $p < .001$) and University levels ($r = .252$, $p < .001$). And finally, in keeping with the pattern for Attitudes Towards Immigration, there is a noticeable reverse in trend observed for Friendship. Here, Elementary School ($r = .218$, $p < .001$) and High School ($r = .226$, $p < .001$) have the strongest relationships (more so than what was

observed for Attitudes Towards Immigration) with Faith Group also showing significance ($r = .095$, $p = .014$). College and University were not significant. Given these supplementary explorations, it is clear that although College and University are most clearly related to the outcome variables on an aggregate level, when considering the qualities/components of experiences, additional insight is gained by looking at the trends across levels of education and community. Taken together, these results offer insight, not only into the qualities and components that relate to Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance (Friendship, Friendship Marginalized, Experiences etc.), but towards the levels of education and areas of community involvement where these qualities take effect.

Regression Analyses

As correlational relationships do not speak to a relationship's direction, regression tests were further employed to examine whether any of the abovementioned experiences predict inclusive attitudes. Table 4 presents the results pertaining to Attitudes Towards Immigration and Table 5 presents the results pertaining to Tolerance. For each dependent variable, several approaches were taken to uncover models that explain the variance in attitude.

Regression Models for Attitudes Towards Immigration

Approach 1: Regressing According to Level of Education/Community Involvement

Table 4 highlights the results for Attitudes Towards Immigration. The first approach was to regress the aggregate variables based on levels of education as well as community involvement, that is, those independent variables pertaining to the area

(or system) of potential influence. Variables entered included: Elementary School (ES), High School (HS), College (C), University (U), Faith Group (FG), Volunteer Group (VG) and Total Years of Education (TYE).

Using a stepwise method of inclusion, four variables were identified for the model of best fit (Model 1). Although this model provides a relatively weak explanation for the variance in attitude (10%), the model was significant ($F=20.13$, $p < .001$). Here, Total Years of Education was the strongest predictor ($\beta^1 = .226$, $p < .001$), followed by Faith Group ($\beta = .117$, $p = .002$), University ($\beta = .112$, $p = .006$) and College ($\beta = .102$, $p = .011$). When considering the strength of correlational effects, it is not surprising that Total Years of Education emerged as the strongest predictor, however Faith Group surpassing University and College was an unexpected finding.

Approach 2: Regressing According to Qualities and Components

Next, in order to examine which quality or component of education accounts for the variance in attitudes towards immigration, these variables were regressed for Model 2. The aggregate variables entered included: Ethnic/Racial Teachers (ERT), Instruction (INS), Experiences (EXP), Foreign Materials (FM), Exchange (EXCH), Friendship (FR), and Friendship Marginalized (FRM). The result of this test offers a weaker explanatory model, accounting for only 7% of the variance, but this operation identifies Friendship ($\beta = .160$, $p < .001$), Friendship Marginalized ($\beta = .153$, $p < .001$) and Exchange ($\beta = .091$, $p = .015$) as significant predictors ($F = 17.99$, $p < .001$).

Because our correlations revealed that Friendship, Friendship Marginalized were most observed at the Elementary and High School levels, yet Model 1 simply

¹ β (Beta) refers to sample and not population parameter throughout this report.

identified College and University as the only predictive levels of education (meanwhile Friendship was not correlated at all at the University or College level with Attitudes Towards Immigration), it is evident that examining aggregate variables alone veils important individual relationships. Important combinations of factors may be suppressed when relying on aggregates alone. Accordingly, a third approach was conducted, Model 3, which regressed the various combinations of level of education/community involvement and quality/component variables.

Approach 3: Regressing Combinations Variables

Model 3 displays the results of regressing various combinations of levels of education/community involvement with quality/component variables. The variables entered included Ethnic/Racial Teachers, Friendship and Friendship Marginalized for all levels of education as well as Friendship and Friendship Marginalized for all levels of education and community involvement. A complete list of specific variables is presented in Table 4, Model 3. Taken together, the variables selected through this approach provide the best model accounting for 12.3% of the variance in Attitude Towards Immigration ($F = 11.44, p < .001$).

Here, seven variables were selected through a stepwise selection. In decreasing order of Beta weight, University Friendship Marginalized ($\beta = .191, p < .001$), High School Experience ($\beta = .119, p = .012$), Elementary School Friendship ($\beta = .103, p = .005$), College Experience ($\beta = .102, p = .007$) and High School Friendship ($\beta = .089, p = .022$), were positive predictors of Attitude Towards Immigration. This model also included two unexpected negative predictors, University Ethnic/Racial Teachers ($\beta = -.079, p = .042$) and High School Instruction

($\beta = -.173$, $p < .001$). Given this model, it appears that the best explanation for Attitudes Toward Immigration, as investigated within this study, results from a selection of experiences across one's educational experiences.

Regression Models for Tolerance

Approach 1: Regressing According to Level of Education/Community Involvement

The same procedure as above was used to identify predictors of Tolerance attitudes. Variables entered included: Elementary School (ES), High School (HS), College (C), University (U), Faith Group (FG), Volunteer Group (VG) and Total Years of Education (TYE). Table 5 summarizes the results of three approaches. Model 1 identifies four variables that were selected to best explain the variance in Tolerance, when regressing all of the education and community aggregates. The same four variables as selected in Model 1 for Attitude Towards Immigration were identified, College, University, Faith Group and Total Years of Education; together, they explained 7.6% of the variance in Tolerance ($F = 14.85$, $p < .001$). Again, Total Years of Education was the strongest predictor ($\beta = .153$, $p < .001$), followed by University ($\beta = .140$, $p = .001$), Faith Group ($\beta = .107$, $p = .005$) and College ($\beta = .087$, $p = .033$). This model differs from that predicting Attitude Towards Immigration slightly in that University is a slightly better predictor than Faith Group.

Approach 2: Regressing According to Qualities and Components

The second approach, regressing the qualities/components of education and community involvement, again, revealed similar results for Tolerance as for Attitudes Towards Immigration; however, this time, only Friendship and Friendship Marginalized were found significant. The aggregate variables entered included:

Ethnic/Racial Teachers (ERT), Instruction (INS), Experiences (EXP), Foreign Materials (FM), Exchange (EXCH), Friendship (FR), and Friendship Marginalized (FRM). Together, these variables significantly ($F = 20.18, p < .001$) account for 7.9% of the variance in attitude with Friendship having a beta weight of .146 ($p < .001$), and Friendship Marginalized having a beta weight of .219 ($p < .001$).

Approach 3: Regressing Combinations Variables

Finally, the third approach regressed various combinations of levels of education/community involvement with quality/component variables. Table 5, Model 3 provides a complete list of variable entered in this test. Within this model, Elementary School Friendship ($\beta = .142, p < .001$), High School Friendship ($\beta = .123, p = .001$), College Experience ($\beta = .119, p = .001$) and University Friendship Marginalized ($\beta = .203, p = .001$), all of which were identified with the model for Attitude Towards Immigration, were identified again as predictors of Tolerance. University Ethnic/Racial Teachers was again identified as a negative predictor ($\beta = -.126, p = .001$), along with High School Instruction ($\beta = -.133, p < .001$). In addition, and dissimilar to the model for Attitude Towards Immigration, University Instruction was also selected as a positive predictor of Tolerance ($\beta = .137, p = .001$). Here again, we the most explanatory model accounting for 16.2% ($F = 19.51, p < .001$) results from a combination of experiences across a variety of educational settings. Neither variables entered for Faith Group or Volunteer Group arenas were significant for either dependent variable.

Summary of Results

These results, including significant correlation and regression relationships will now be summarized with respect to the hypotheses put forth for this research project.

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis 1 stated that Elementary School, High School, College, University, Faith Group and Volunteer Group would be positively related with both outcome variables. On an aggregate level, neither Elementary School nor High School were significantly related to Attitudes Towards Immigration or Tolerance, findings that did not support the hypothesis. However, when investigating further, it was found that at the Elementary School level, both Friendship, and Friendship Marginalized were significantly correlated with each outcome variable, as was also the case for these variables at High School. Specifically, both Friendship, and Friendship Marginalized were comparatively strong relationships with Tolerance at the Elementary and High school level when comparing their correlation coefficients with others of significance within this study. As aggregate scales College, University, Faith Group and Volunteer Group were all significantly positively related to both outcome variables, as predicted in Hypothesis 1, although not yielding correlation coefficients of great strength. Volunteer Group was most weakly related, with a significance of $p < .05$.

When looking to the results of the regression tests, there is evidence that the relationship for Elementary School as an aggregate was not a significant predictor of either outcome variable, however for both Attitudes Towards Immigration and

Tolerance, Elementary School Friendship specifically was a significant predictor. Likewise, while High School was not identified as a predictor within the regression tests for either outcome, High School Friendship was a significant predictor for both outcomes, while High School Experiences was a significant predictor of Attitudes Towards Immigration. Of notable contradiction to Hypothesis 1, High School Instruction was a significant predictor of negative attitudes for both outcome variables. The regression models revealed that College, University and Faith Group were significant predictors in Models 1 for each outcome variable, supporting Hypothesis 1. Volunteer Group was not a significant predictor, nor were any volunteer associated variables significant in Models 3. Overall, Hypothesis 1 was partially supported.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis 2 stated that University would have the strongest relationship within the abovementioned aggregates. The correlations in Table 1 confirm that of all levels of education, University appears to have the greatest strength and significance of relationship, in accord with the second hypothesis. This relationship was further supported within the regression models where University had the third greatest beta weight for Attitudes Towards Immigration and the second highest beta weight for Tolerance. Faith Group had the second highest beta weight for Attitudes Towards Immigration, a finding that was unexpected for Hypothesis 2. When looking at the combination variables within regression tests for both Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance, we observe that three University variables were significant within

both models, more than for any other level. Hypothesis two is supported, however a review of Hypothesis three, below, adds context to this finding.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis 3 stated that Total Years of Education would be positively related with both outcome variables, however Hypothesis 2 stated that University would have the strongest overall relationships. Directly relating to both Hypothesis 2 and 3 was the finding that Total Years of Education was most strongly correlated and was the strongest predictor in Model 1 for each outcome variable. Total Years of Education in fact showed the strongest relationships. While the Total Years of Education was investigated in comparison to levels of education, the greatest likelihood is that respondents who reported a greater number of years of education were almost certainly reporting additional years attending College or University. While it was unexpected to see that Total Years of Education would bear a stronger relationship with the outcome variables, the trend will later be discussed due to the possibility that Total Years of Education represents an increased influence of post-secondary studies on the outcome variables. Overall, these findings support Hypothesis three.

Hypothesis Four

Hypothesis 4 stated that Ethnic/Racial Teachers, Instruction, Experiences, Foreign Materials, Exchange, Friendship and Friendship Marginalized would be positively related with both Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance. First, there was no statistically significant correlation for Ethnic/Racial Teachers with either

Table 4. Attitudes Towards Immigration Regression Models

Model 1					Model 2				
	Beta	t	Tol	VIF		Beta	t	Tol	VIF
ES	x				ERT	x			
HS	x				INS	x			
C	.102	2.54	.836	1.19	EXP	x			
U	.112	2.75	.814	1.22	FM	x			
FG	.117	3.15	.967	1.03	EXCH	.091	2.43	.998	1.02
VG	x				FR	.160	4.07	.895	1.11
TYE	.226	6.16	.998	1.00	FRM	.153	3.89	.894	1.11
Adj R2	.102				Adj R2	.071			
F	20.135, p < 0.01				F	17.99, p < 0.01			
D.W.	1.87				D.W.	1.76			

Model 3				
	Beta	t	Tol	VIF
ES/ERT	x			
ES/INS	x			
ES/EXP	x			
ES/FR	.109	2.84	8.86	1.12
ES/FRM	x			
HS/ERT	x			
HS/INS	(-.173)	(-3.66)	.588	1.70
HS/EXP	.119	2.51	.584	1.71
HS/FM	x			
HS/EXCH	x			
HS/FR	.089	2.29	.869	1.15
HS/FRM	x			
C/ERT	x			
C/INS	x			
C/EXP	.102	2.68	.902	1.10
C/FM	x			
C/EXCH	x			
C/FR	x			
C/FRM	x			
U/ERT	(-.079)	(-2.03)	.863	1.15
U/INS	x			
U/EXP	x			
U/FM	x			
U/EXCH	.103	2.81	.974	1.02
U/FR	x			
U/FRM	.191	4.91	.867	1.15
FG/FR	x			
FG/FRM	x			
VG/FR	x			
VG/FRM	x			
Adj R2	.123			
F	11.44, p < 0.01			
D.W.	1.84			

Note: Beta refers to sample and not population parameter

Table 5. Tolerance Regression Models

Model 1					Model 2				
	Beta	t	Tol	VIF		Beta	t	Tol	VIF
ES	x				ERT	(-.103)	(-2.59)	.870	1.15
HS	x				INS	x			
C	.087	2.14	.836	1.19	EXP	x			
U	.140	3.40	.814	1.22	FM	x			
FG	.107	2.83	.967	1.03	EXCH	x			
VG	x				FR	.146	3.71	.890	1.12
TYE	.153	4.12	.998	1.00	FRM	.219	5.21	.780	1.28
Adj R2	.076				Adj R2	.079			
F	14.85, p < 0.01				F	20.18, p < 0.01			
D.W.	1.84				D.W.	1.81			

Model 3				
	Beta	t	Tol	VIF
ES/ERT	x			
ES/INS	x			
ES/EXP	x			
ES/FR	.142	3.80	.892	1.12
ES/FRM	x			
HS/ERT	x			
HS/INS	(-.133)	(-3.56)	.897	1.11
HS/EXP	x			
HS/FM	x			
HS/EXCH	x			
HS/FR	.123	3.24	8.72	1.14
HS/FRM	x			
C/ERT	x			
C/INS	x			
C/EXP	.119	3.21	.910	1.09
C/FM	x			
C/EXCH	x			
C/FR	x			
C/FRM	x			
U/ERT	(-.126)	(-3.22)	.818	1.22
U/INS	.137	3.46	.800	1.25
U/EXP	x			
U/FM	x			
U/EXCH	x			
U/FR	x			
U/FRM	.203	5.20	.819	1.22
FG/FR	x			
FG/FRM	x			
VG/FR	x			
VG/FRM	x			
Adj R2	.162			
F	19.51			
D.W.	1.88			

Note: Beta refers to sample and not population parameter

outcome variable. Again, within the correlation trends, Ethnic/Racial Teachers was not correlated at any level of education. However, when using Ethnic/Racial Teachers as a regressor, it was actually found to have a negative predictive relationship with Tolerance. When the combination variables were regressed in Models 3, University Ethnic/Racial Teachers was again found to be negatively related to both outcome variables. Second, Instruction was not significantly correlated as an aggregate with either outcome, however at the College and University level, these relationships were significant and positive, in keeping with Hypothesis 4. Of interest, Instruction at the High School level was also found to be negatively related to both outcome variables, a peculiar finding that contrasts with this hypothesis. Experiences were positively correlated with Attitudes Towards Immigration, but not for Tolerance, however at the College and University level again, Experience was positively correlated with both. As an aggregate, Experience was not a significant predictor of either outcome variable, however High School Experiences was significant in the regression Model 3 for Attitudes Towards Immigration, as well as College Experience for Tolerance. Foreign Material was not significantly related to either outcome as an aggregate, yet in keeping with the trend, it was for College and more strongly so for University outcomes. Exchange was significantly correlated for Attitudes Towards Immigration, but not Tolerance; at specific educational levels, University Exchange was the only significant relationship with both outcomes again. Finally, Friendship was positively correlated with both outcome variables on the aggregate level, however for each, this seemed to stem from significant relationships at the Elementary and High School level, which were not present at College or University. And finally, Friendship Marginalized was positively correlated with both outcomes, as well as significant at all levels of education

and community involvement. As an aggregate scale, Friendship and Friendship Marginalized had predictive relationships with both outcome variables, and in Model 3 for both Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance, University Friendship Marginalized was the strongest predictor. Overall, Hypothesis 4 was partly supported for all variables depending on whether they were examined in aggregate or across educational and community arenas. The abovementioned findings present differing support for this hypothesis, and ones that differ according to context.

Hypothesis Five

Finally, Hypothesis 5 stated that Casual Contact would be negatively related to both Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance. This hypothesis was clearly supported by negative correlation coefficients when aggregated across all scenarios. As well, Friendship's predictive relationship with both outcomes illustrates the clear effect of casual versus true acquaintance contact, in support of Hypothesis five.

CHAPTER 5: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between certain social aspects of education and community experiences and how they relate to inclusive attitudes towards ethnic and racial minorities. The intention was to attain a greater understanding on how inclusive attitudes relate to Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance throughout various social systems.

The results of this research demonstrate general support for the hypotheses put forth; however, it is clear that the relationships are best explained by looking both at the level of education and community involvement as well as the qualities and characteristics there within. Although overall trends have been identified at the aggregate level, looking deeper within the results offers more specific clues as to what discrete aspects relate to one's Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance. Moreover, regression analysis demonstrates that the variance in one's Attitudes Towards Immigration and/or Tolerance can be partially explained through a selection of variables explored throughout this study, as several of them show a predictive relationship with attitudes. The variance accounted for differed based on the model of regression, with the best method looking at the qualities and characteristics specific to each level of education and community location. In this chapter, the most notable highlights of this study will be discussed, as well as their implications, the limitations of this study and suggested directions for future research.

Friendship

One of the most prominent relationships illustrated within this study is between reported Friendship with peers who represent different ethnic and racial backgrounds

and inclusive attitudes. This finding relates to contact theories, which are among the most historical and widespread discussions relating to inclusive attitudes and prejudice. The relationship between contact and prejudice has been underexplored in research to date, and certainly not meaningfully assessed with respect to the specific social spheres within which contact and friendship occur. In order to empirically distinguish between casual contact and true acquaintance, or friendship contact, these variables were recoded based on the respondents' report of the representation of different ethnic/racial peers within their school, faith or volunteer group against the degree to which such diversity was represented within their personal group of friends. Accordingly, Friendship and Casual Contact were created as inverse variables. While assessing friendship itself has been an uncommon approach within this field of research, it was a further departure that friendship was not simply assessed as self-reported friendships, but rather it accounted for the opportunity to create friendships with ethnically and racially diverse people. For example, one who made several friends within a school that did not represent diversity received a high score for Friendship, while someone who made no diverse friendships despite a large presence of ethnic/racially diverse students scored lower. This also ensured that individuals who did not report friendships were not penalized if there were no diverse peers with whom to make friends. Likewise, this approach allowed a meaningful method of examining the relationship whereby casual contact occurred without friendships being formed. As a result, Allport's (1979) concepts of 'true acquaintance' and casual contact were explored. Here, Friendship, especially friendships created under circumstances of less opportunity were related to inclusive attitudes, and likewise, the inverse was true; those who did not form diverse friendships despite the opportunity to do so were more correlated with negative attitudes. Previous

research demonstrated lack of generalizability of contact theories to understanding prejudice. This research contributes a level of understanding to the debate. This finding disagrees with previous research asserting a direct relationship between contact (of any type) and reduced prejudice (Watson, 1947; Williams, 1979), and lends further support to the finding that more favourable scenarios of contact, such as those characteristic of friendship are positively related with inclusive ethnic and racial attitudes (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew 1998; Crawley, 2005).

Elementary and High School Friendship

One of the most interesting findings pertaining to friendships was that they were most strongly related to inclusive attitudes when they were reported at the Elementary and High School levels, and not so at College or University. Again, this relationship was further established when Elementary and High School Friendship both emerged as significant predictors within the regression models of best fit for both outcome variables, while Friendship at the later years did not. Discovering a relationship between contact and attitudes specific to levels of education is a completely new research contribution. This suggests a resilient impact of friendships created throughout one's primary and adolescent years, and lasting effect on inclusive attitudes. While friendship has been reported in literature to relate to inclusive attitudes (Pettigrew, 1998), this is the first empirical study that specifically examines the effects of friendship at different levels of education, or areas of life, for that matter. In this regard, this finding contributes to our understanding of how contact, and specifically 'true acquaintance' or friendship-types can have an influence on one's attitudes.

In querying what accounts for this relationship, it is plausible that since contact is thought to undermine negative stereotypes (Forbes, 2004), favourable contact during one's earlier years may serve as a protective factor that prevents the formation of negative stereotypes and rather normalizes equality relationships across cultures.

This suggests that the early years, including Elementary and High School are fruitful areas for intervention. Practically speaking, it seems that the early years may also be the easiest years within which to intervene through policies and procedures. Additionally, interventions may have the potential to reach beyond issues of ethnic and racial prejudice. If contact within one's early years protects against certain negative stereotypes, it begs the question: what other attitudes of interest to society could be influenced at these times? Perhaps more research should examine the potential in studying youth as foci for interventions that target broader societal concerns.

A better understanding of early experiences, most specifically relationships within various ecological systems could well provide fruitful insight into macro level interventions. Again, levels of education were the only childhood and teen experiences studied within this research, which raises questions as to whether the findings here extend to wider systems of community interaction during one's earlier years. Faith group experiences, sports, participation in summer camps and programs etc., all of which were not assessed within this study may also reveal hopeful findings. Exploring these avenues would offer a more complete systems examination of the influence of earlier years on attitudes towards immigration and tolerance, as well as to other attitudes of interest.

Faith Group Friendship

Again, while it was unexpected that Elementary School and High School would be most strongly correlated with both outcome variables, it is equally interesting to note that the only other arena where Friendship was correlated was at the Faith Group level. It appears that no other study has investigated the possibility that faith group involvement could be related to inclusive attitudes towards ethnic and racial minorities, nor have any theoretical discourse taken place to explore this possibility. Although Faith Group Friendship was not predictive within the regression models of best fit, this study provides evidence that a significant relationship exists, and possibly one worthy of further exploration.

On a surface level, this finding may oppose expectations based on contemporary literature; for example, in light of threat theories that speak to the realistic and symbolic threats that contribute towards negative attitudes (Stephan et al., 1998; Ward & Masgoret, 2006), immigration could conceivably be associated with an influx of opposing religious and moral ideologies, those threatening the dominant ideologies, and therefore leading to more negative attitudes. This study is limited in that it did not differentiate between religious affiliations when querying faith group participation; accordingly, it is unknown whether respondents were from Jewish, Catholic or Protestant Christian, Islamic or other backgrounds, or, whether the responses differ according to faith groups.

Threat theories can conversely be used to explain this trend. Faith Groups may be viewed as institutions within civil society that provide for social, emotional, as well as spiritual needs. Additionally, the social connections offered through faith affiliation may afford employment opportunities through networking or financial security due to

benevolent communities. Accordingly, the securities offered within Faith Groups may insulate individuals from the salience of threats perceived by others who do not belong to faith communities.

An alternative explanation for this trend could rest in foundational theories on social capital. According to this perspective, faith groups, even homogenous ones are beneficial (Larsen et al., 2004). Social capital refers to the social ties that exist between individuals and it is an indicator that individuals will act in mutually beneficial collective action (Steinberger, 1981 as cited in Larsen et al., 2004). There are two forms of social capital. *Bonding social capital* is that which occurs within a homogenous community of individuals, as is the case with faith based organizations (Larsen et al., 2004). *Bridging social capital* occurs when members of one group connect with members of another group or groups (Larson et al., 2004). What is interesting to note is that bonding social capital is a necessary antecedent for the development of bridging social capital (Larsen et al., 2004). This means that participation within a homogenous group increases the chances that participants will develop social ties across heterogeneous groups. This relationship may explain why faith group participation was correlated with inclusive attitudes; the benefits of bonding social capital may increase one's willingness and/or propensity to form bridging relationships, which may in turn reflect more open Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance. The more individuals relate with individuals who share likeminded interests and goals, the more open they may be for forming relationships with those who they consider different to themselves. Staral (2000) considers the church a vital link in the pursuit of change at macro levels; she recommends the cooperation of social workers with faith-based organizations to take an activist approach towards meeting community needs.

Nevertheless, given this relationship, one could query why Volunteer Groups did not also demonstrate significant results because presumably individuals belonging to volunteer groups would share something in common akin to a homogenous group. It may be that the similarities and connections experienced at a volunteer group may not be as pronounced as within faith groups, or the saliency of homogeneity within volunteer groups may not be evident to all participants; lack of a homogenous connection could restrict the social capital impact of the group. In contrast, a faith group may form a closer community that extends beyond goal-oriented volunteer groups that generally exist to promote a specific purpose. Therefore a closer sense of connection may yield increased social capital benefits within the wider community.

Notwithstanding the theoretical explanations that may account for this trend, the results of this study do not offer concrete understanding of this relationship. Of course, because the relationship here is correlational, one cannot exclude the possibility that the relationship is due to more tolerant/inclusive individuals and families choosing to participate in faith groups, conceivably for an outlet for their desire to be inclusive. Still, it is significant to recognize the connection between Faith Group participation's correlation with inclusive attitudes and perhaps to investigate this system in further detail within additional research. This connection is an important one as it specifically highlights the fruits of informal community development avenues. Within this study, Faith Group was the only system not governed by public or formal authorities. The possibility that Faith Group participation contributes towards inclusive attitudes serves as a reminder that the solutions for social concerns are not always created by experts, or implemented in top down solutions; rather, community institutions are assets that can add to our knowledge of social issues, and likewise contribute towards solutions. In this

sense, community agencies should be recognized for their contributions to areas of macro concern, rather than simply “federalizing” problems (Etzioni, 1982) by limiting solutions to top-down approaches.

Friendship with Marginalized Individuals

The next unique contribution of this research relates to the deeper exploration of the relationship between friendship and inclusive attitudes. Bratt (2005) suggested that interethnic friendships produce spin-off benefits, as friendships with one outgroup may increase openness to share contact with other outgroups. This research tested a theory along similar lines: whether friendships with individuals from other marginalized groups had bearing on one’s ethnic and racial attitudes. Friendship Marginalized was one of the strongest aggregate measures that correlated to both Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance. Moreover, when examining the correlational trends across the levels of education and community involvement, Friendship Marginalized was the *only* variable which was positively and significantly correlated at *all* levels. The correlation was most pronounced at the University level. These findings break ice on a remarkably understudied area within social sciences, and surprisingly within social work literature. The discovery that friendship with individuals from marginalized groups (seemingly irrespective of which marginalized group, as this was not assessed) significantly and consistently correlates within inclusive Attitudes on Toward Immigration and Tolerance relates to Anti-Oppressive theories. Anti-Oppressive theories are grounded in the idea that “Anti-oppressive practice is concerned with eradicating social injustice perpetuated by societal structural inequalities, particularly along the lines of race, gender, sexual orientation and identity, ability, age, class, occupation and social service usage”

(Dumbrill, 2003, p.56). Anti-oppressive theories also emphasize the importance of examining all forms of oppression, both individual and systemic together in order to eradicate social injustice. In this sense, all forms of oppression are considered for their common intersections. Given this, it seems appropriate that social work research would explore these intersections.

The consistent results pertaining to Friendship Marginalized could result because individuals who hold particularly favourable attitudes on the outcome measures also have a propensity to over report their historical and current friendships; investigating such a possibility would require further examination to explore these relationships. Perhaps further investigation may best be achieved through qualitative methods, to attain experiential narratives and reflections that shed light on the meaning individuals assign these friendships and how they translate into attitudes.

Nevertheless, these finding point towards the intersections of powerlessness and oppression, and their commonalities – not merely at a theoretical level, but also at the conscious and unconscious levels where individuals form their attitudes and perceptions, and theoretically from which behaviours are born. One broad implication of this area may be that looking narrowly at one form of prejudice limits the explanations, as well as interventions pertaining to broader forms of marginalization and oppression. Just as oppression is not an isolated action by one individual upon another, nor does the solution for one form of oppression rest solely within an understanding of that form alone. This finding is also encouraging from an interventionist perspective as it suggests that jurisdictions of less ethnic/racial diversity can still be impacted by promoting true acquaintance contact across any divides caused by marginalization. This trend draws attention to a previously unmentioned discourse pertaining to the

assessment of attitudes towards immigrants: power and privilege; this topic will be discussed later on in this chapter.

Education

University vs. Total Years of Education

Total Years of Education was found to have the strongest effect for both correlation and regression tests. Case et al. (1989) and Fortin and Lowen (2007) both noted that education is consistently shown to increase attitudes of racial equality. Chandler and Tsei (2001) however found that post-secondary education had a stronger impact on attitudes than the total years of education. Given this, it was expected that University and perhaps College would demonstrate stronger relationships than total years of education. When examining the years of education reported by participants; however, it seems that the bulk of years reported beyond 17 (the average number of years reported for schooling prior to attending College or University), represent education attained at the College or University level. This makes sense, as there is a finite number of years one can spend at elementary school and/or high school between completing required years, failing and repeating grades or doing “victory laps” to upgrade one’s transcript. Accordingly, it is arguable that the stronger relationship seen for Total Years of Education is simply a compound effect of added exposure to elements of College and University that increase one’s propensity towards inclusive attitudes. Again, University is characterised by more diverse social networks and forms of learning (Chandler & Tsei, 2001; Case et al., 1989) and helps to reduce over-identification with localistic ingroups. Accordingly, it is not surprising that University variables appear most frequently as significant factors in the regression models. When

comparing the results for College and University, it should be noted that two respondents voluntarily made contact after completing the survey to note that they had accidentally input their responses for University in the College section. After the pilot survey, a comment was added at the College section reading, “note: this section refers to college experiences and NOT University. University experiences will be addressed in the following section”. Even with this comment, since it was identified that some respondents still input responses in the incorrect section, the differences between College and University responses should be interpreted in light of this consideration since it is not possible to know whether more than two respondents made this error. Nevertheless, this research supports previous findings that education, particularly education experienced at the post secondary level, has a clear relationship with inclusive attitudes.

With respect to Education however, there were two quite surprising anomalies within Model 3 for both Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance: the negative relationship for Ethnic/Racial Teachers and High School Instruction.

Unexpected Findings

Ethnic/Racial Teachers

Because the finding that Ethnic/Racial teachers was in stark contrast to the hypothesized result, further analysis was undertaken to explore whether the unexpected relationship was due to a suppressor effect. That is, whether an authentic relationship between Attitudes Towards Immigration or Tolerance and Ethnic/Racial Teachers at the University level was being masked by another variable that was not detected through the stepwise selection. When the strength in relationship between independent and

dependent variable increases when a third variable is included would indicate suppression (MacKinnon et al., 2000). Even though there were no indications of colinearity problems, the regressions were re-run several times, each time removing a single variable until Ethnic/Racial Teachers alone remained. At this point when the relationship between University Ethnic/Racial Teachers tested alone, although not significant as a single variable it still displayed a negative relationship with both outcome variables. To make certain, the excluded variables were re-entered in reverse order. Regardless of the variables entered or removed, University Ethnic/Racial Teachers maintained a negative relationship within the regression tests. Accordingly it does not appear that a simple suppressor effect explains this unexpected finding, although this does not exclude the possibility that a more complex interaction between variables led to this result.

The data then suggests that the presence of Ethnic/Racial Teachers, specifically at the University level has a negative bearing on one's Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance. It had been anticipated that Ethnic/Racial Teachers would offer means of attaining cultural knowledge which has been shown to reduce prejudicial attitudes (Bratt, 2005). At the University level, Instruction, Experiences, Foreign Material and Exchange, also thought to be forms of cultural knowledge were positively correlated with Attitudes Towards Immigration; likewise each of these variables were positively correlated with Tolerance. And at the University level, Exchange was also positively predictive of Attitudes Towards Immigration, while the other variables were insignificant within models for both outcome variables. Given these trends, it is peculiar that Ethnic/Racial Teachers demonstrates an opposite effect.

While one could look to existing theories in an attempt to explain this anomaly, it is clear that this unexpected trend warrants examination in future research.

High School Instruction

The only other variable which also showed a negative relationship was High School Instruction, which again had been predicted to have a positive relationship attributable to cultural knowledge acquisition. While High School Experiences was positively predictive for Attitudes Towards Immigration, the negative relationship with Instruction was surprising. Instruction had no predictive relationships at the Elementary School, College or University level. Assuming that no suppressor effects were taking place, there may be an explanation pertaining to the impact of instruction at this specific age. For example, previous research has demonstrated that overt attempts to influence people's attitudes can result in increased prejudice (Esses et al., 2006). If High School students interpret instruction about other countries and cultures as an agenda to influence their worldview and attitudes, it may reinforce their negative beliefs. Taking into account the possibility of peer norms, which are particularly strong during teenage years, cynical attitudes expressed by fellow students may further solidify negative stereotypes within the peer group. If replication verifies this trend, it may call for educators to be cautious in how they present cultural instruction at the High School level so as not to overtly challenge existing attitudes. Or, perhaps the relationships can be further explored to consider for example, whether increasing the amount of cultural instruction at the elementary school level when children's views are perhaps more malleable, could pre-empt the negative impacts associated with instruction at the high school level. At a minimum this research has identified two seemingly contradictory

findings: University Ethnic/Racial Teachers and High School Instruction. These findings provide a baseline for future investigations, but also highlight the necessity for examining more closely theories pertaining to power and privilege, a basis which has not yet been explored within literature to examine inclusive attitudes.

So far, the results and anomalies have been discussed within the context of the broad theories that exist. It is likely that theories to date are inadequate to fully understand the complexities of inclusive attitudes. Perhaps more qualitative studies could better explain the findings from within this research as well as to ground theories for future qualitative tests.

Participant Feedback

While qualitative feedback was not specifically collected, certain participants voluntarily submitted feedback after completing the survey to offer their opinions about the research. Incorporating this feedback is in keeping with a post-positive research paradigm. The input was useful, as it suggests some limitations with the approach used with this research. Likewise, some of the feedback offers clues that may explain the low variance accounted for within the regression models. For example, this research incorporated a systems perspective to identify components specific to certain social systems, and then tested how these relate to inclusive attitudes. However, this research was also undertaken knowing that only certain systems were being examined, while others were excluded due to the parameters of this project. Accordingly, the feedback offered by some respondents indicates that certain unexamined systems had significant self-reported impact on their own experiences; perhaps these areas warrant consideration in future research to offer a more comprehensive ecological exploration.

For example, one respondent wrote, "I'm disappointed the survey didn't have any questions about the workplace. I and a lot of people I work with have had some fairly unique first hand experiences with foreign cultures." Another participant wrote, "just thought I'd let you know my thoughts as well.... the survey asks a lot about ethnicity in educational environments, but doesn't take into account other forms of learning such as travels or your everyday work environment". Such comments suggest that both the workplace/employment experiences, as well as travel are important areas of consideration that were not investigated within this project.

In the future, employment could be explored in a similar manner to faith and volunteer groups by assessing the amount of contact within their place of employment and work group; there are also conceivable gains in cultural knowledge that one could attain through employment. Travel experiences could be examined from a contact approach, and also in light of the variety of opportunities for cultural knowledge attainment that are afforded from being immersed within different countries and cultures. Of course there are numerous factors that would need to be considered if examining travel, for example, the length of stay overseas, whether one visited a resort with predominantly Western guests and whether individuals left their resort to engage with the local culture, what was the motivation for travel, what cross-cultural components characterised the experience etc. Given the finding that University Exchange was positively correlated and predictive of both Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance, travel experiences should be flagged as an aspect to be considered within future research. Perhaps more thorough exploration of these factors could ultimately explain more variance in inclusive attitudes and point towards more approaches for intervention.

Along similar lines, the effect of Friendship at Elementary School and High School education levels were explored, but no other systems within which children and adolescents form inter-ethnic friendships were explored. Given the findings of this study, these areas could likely reveal significant relationships.

Limitations

This research is also characterised by additional limitations which should be considered in order to weigh the interpretations and generalizability of these findings.

Ethnic vs. Racial

First, notwithstanding an effort to comprehensively assess attitudes, there remain problems with using Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance as the outcome measures. For example, one respondent offered feedback on the wording used within these measures: “you keep grouping “racial” and “ethnic” as if they are the same thing...but there are greater connotations to ethnicity than race.” While I believe the Attitudes Towards Immigration and Tolerance scales to be more meaningful than single item scales, for example, the wording “ethnic” and “racial” is clearly problematic for several reasons. The one presented by the participants is valid: race and ethnicity are distinct and this research failed to extract the differences in connotation, and any resulting impact on attitude. Moreover, this research did not distinguish between ethnic groups at all, between which attitudes may vary significantly.

Oversimplification of Issues

Perhaps what is most problematic is that reliance on survey methods offered no forum to account for why one may have differing attitudes, effectively attempting to

oversimplify a complex issue. For example, one comment read, “I would comment about the survey that it was sometimes hard to know how to answer...I think that immigration changes Canadian culture significantly, but I don’t necessarily think that’s a bad thing. And whereas I don’t feel threatened by the influx of other cultures or ethnic groups, I do feel threatened by the influx of certain ideologies, like, say Islam”.

Another individual qualified their attitudes by saying “I am all for immigration, but I am totally against laws that make it easier for one person (immigrant or not) to get a job over another...in my opinion, it’s not the immigration or the education that threatens Canada’s ‘culture’ it is the laws that force us to adjust to meet other demands”. Such a sentiment was noted by several respondents who felt as though their responses would make them appear ‘racist’, although their concern was reportedly less to do with *immigrants* themselves, or even *immigration* as a trend, but more so to do with the larger policies surrounding integration.

Such feedback illustrates the complexities of studying the topic of immigration, immigrants, racism and prejudice. These concepts do not fall neatly into discrete and measurable categories that lend themselves towards tidy, simplified approaches.

“Lumping” Experiences

Along this line however, especially given the desire to uphold anti-oppressive values, it would be remiss not to mention the lack of opportunity for qualitative input for those respondents of ethnic and/or racial distinction themselves. One respondent anonymously expressed their disappointment that “experiences of diversity [were] all lumped together”. The effect of doing so appeared to “neutralize the pain of diversity as experienced by a minority.” This statement was qualified by saying, “yes the black

student among white classmates and the students at a more diverse school experience diversity but the substance of the experiences is very different.” Indeed, the research instrument allowed no forum for respondents to explain their responses or speak to the substance of their experiences. This highlights how this approach muzzled the voices that have so much to offer to our understanding of inclusive attitudes, or lack thereof.

Despite this, in some regards this approach endeavoured at the least to be inclusive in definition of Canadian, and in invitation of respondents. Although this may amount to mere tokenism, the intent in ascertaining feedback from any resident, whether citizen or not, was to acknowledge the breadth of individuals who consider themselves Canadian and to invite their input. However, it is clear that this approach, specifically its quantitative nature silenced narratives that would have provided a richer account of individuals’ experiences. Accordingly, a qualitative approach would have given voice to stories, shed additional insight and offered new directions for exploration, moreover – in a more empowering manner. Denzin (2002) emphasizes the need for critical qualitative approaches in social work research although more evidence-based, scientific approaches are often the norm (Strier, 2007).

Confidence

This study had the benefit of a large sample size that reflected a breadth of backgrounds. Given the weak correlation coefficients attained within this project, the results should be considered with caution. However, the sample size indicates that although weak, these results indicate significant and confident relationships. Lewis-Beck et al. (2004) note that the argument that large samples can prove anything with statistics is not entirely correct, and that within large samples, even small changes or

weak correlations can be extremely significant. "One should not be blinded by the number representing the correlation coefficient" (Lewis-Beck et al., 2004, p. 201) but other factors should be taken into account to interpret these numbers, including whether regression coefficients are also significant, and the probabilities of Type I and Type II errors. In this case, correlations highlighted and discussed were predominantly at the $p < .01$ level of significance, with some results at the $p < .05$ level. Additionally, a sample of 672, even when considering a population as large as Canada, at 95% confidence level the confidence interval is 3.7%, and at 99% confidence level the confidence interval is 4.7%, factors which allow the correlations, although weak, to be considered real and significant for interpretation. Moreover, the differences in strength between variables, although small, may likewise be significant considerations. Finally, as noted as relevant considerations, regression testing was subsequently done, therefore the relationships that were revealed within both correlation and regression tests can be confidently presented and interpreted given this sample and the probabilities of error.

Nevertheless, the regression tests do not offer models accounting for a large degree of variance in either Attitudes Towards Immigration or Tolerance. It was previously stated that several systems were not examined within this study, and that they may account for increased variance (e.g. employment, travel etc.). Also, an area mentioned within the literature review but not explored at all within this research are internal dimensions. To recap, Social Dominance Orientation and Right Wing Authoritarianism are two personality dimensions that have been found to relate to negative attitudes (Heaven & St. Quintin, 2003). It is plausible that personality dimensions factor into one's attitudes in ways that cannot be captured by an ecological systems approach that focuses on tangible life scenarios that relate to attitudes; assessing

internal dispositions would require a systems approach that considers sub-systems within individuals. This was not attempted within this study. While individual differences were not explored, in part due to their less possible potential for interventions, their affect on attitude may nevertheless be significant. Exploration of these factors could potentially add to the completeness of these models. Of course, the weak degree of variance explained by the models can also be evidence that a systems approach, as attempted through this research, is not the most applicable basis for explaining what contributes towards inclusive attitudes. Despite the lack of a complete model, it remains an important contribution that certain variables were identified as predictive of inclusive attitudes. Beyond correlations, such findings provide *direction* which is useful for querying relationships within future research and likewise for considering current policies and procedures as well as future interventions.

On the note of which factors relate to attitudes, it should be restated that a main goal was to offer a pragmatic approach to research that would shed light on methods of intervention – or at least inch towards a greater understanding. It is my belief that from a social perspective, this research did in fact accomplish this. Several clues for intervention will be highlighted.

Implications and Interventions

Friendship During Early Years

The finding that Elementary and High School Friendship were both correlated and predictive of inclusive attitudes for both outcomes is an important clue for intervention strategies. For example, efforts at a school level to encourage inter-ethnic collaboration, cooperation and ultimately friendship may be relevant intervention

approaches to consider. Things as simple as assigned group work teams or seating plans within the classroom could be explored. Moreover, interventions at parallel systems for these age groups can be considered. Essentially any activity that promotes mutual goals and friendship could have an impact, such as team sports and after-school programs.

Policy and Funding

An exploration of these findings, as well as future research can provide guidance (or a starting point, at least) for policy and funding initiatives, as well as highlight systemic barriers to promoting inclusive attitudes. For example, Marginalized Friendships had positive relationships at all levels of school and community involvement. When one considers the intersections of marginalization, one notices less opportunity for disabled persons, immigrants, and individuals of lower socio-economic status to participate in extra-curricular activities or community sports. Newcomers in particular are faced with barriers such as racialized poverty and less disposable income, reduced ability to communicate in an official language, obligations to care for younger siblings while their parents work to earn more income and/or attend English courses etc. Economic and social marginalization occur within immigrant groups and these constraints prevent them from enjoying the same participation as the privileged members of society (George et al., 2003).

Reframing Issues and Approaches

An anti-oppressive stance recognizes that this scenario does not just negatively impact *them*, but it has a negative bearing on all of *us* (whoever '*us*' or '*them*' may be). Systemic barriers to youth participation perpetuates the negative attitudes that maintain

marginalization, further perpetuating negative attitudes. A major question should be: how can we alleviate barriers to participation in order to promote exchange of genuine relationships and cultural knowledge? It may be that taxation rules, community organizing, micro and macro policies all can make a difference in this regard. However, perhaps the most important recognition is that such actions do not represent a hand out for individual need or benefit, but as for our collective benefit – to help create more inclusive communities and a more inclusive Canada. The idea of reframing issues of interethnic inclusion leads to a final, yet imperative point of discussion: power and privilege.

The Invisible and Unspoken Discussion

Power and Privilege

A theme that has been hinted towards throughout this discussion, but conspicuously absent within the literature foundation for attitudes towards immigration and immigrants, is the topic of power and privilege. In truth, this topic was only broached as an afterthought to the exploration of other discussion topics within this study. Accordingly, this topic is reserved for the end of the discussion – both as acknowledgment of its importance, but also, as a symbolic placement that reflects its prior omission, and my now conscious acknowledgement thereof. Ironically, since power and privilege are characterized by elusive and often invisible mechanisms, it is not entirely surprising that they were not consciously on hand for discussion purposes and incorporated from the onset. My hope is that being candid in this regard speaks to how pervasive an effect the invisibility and silence of privilege and power can be, and

their conspiracy to exalt “whiteness” at the expense of those of ethnic, and most particularly of racial, distinction.

An acknowledgement of race and difference as contexts for understanding power and privilege is missing in current theories (Dei, 1999). Likewise, there is little discussion about “the role ‘whiteness as the norm’ plays in sustaining social privilege beyond that which is accorded marginalized others” (Guess, 2006, p. 650). When considering marginalized others according to race, also known as “racialization”, the “others” can be identified due to the virtue of being non-white. Race is predominantly categorized by visible differences in skin colour. While race is not a biological or scientific artifact, it has been constructed historically, culturally and politically (Guess, 2006). Over time, the oppression of “others”, particularly along racial lines, has waned from overt and pervasive acts of racism to covert and elusive forms that are less noticeably recognized, or acknowledged. Racism has influenced cultural norms according to the assumption of white superiority; accordingly racism is reflected today in differential opportunities within economic, health, social and even death rate differentials between whites and non-whites (Guess, 2006).

Racism, therefore, pertains to the protection of acquired privileges afforded to “whites” after years of subjugating “others”. “Whiteness” remains “a non-salient, taken-for-granted hegemonic racial category” (Lamont & Molnar, 2002, p. 175). Skin colour therefore acts as a currency, an important marker of privilege that has largely dictated what is normal and acceptable (Dei, 1999). It is based on these ideals that exclusion and marginalization take place.

Exclusion represents a denial of social and civic rights, whereby a process of ‘racialization’ or ‘ethnicization’ ensures that individuals or groups are limited from the

benefits enjoyed by the wider society (Ratcliffe, 1990, p. 150). Although white people stand to gain from the privilege afforded by oppressing "others", this is largely denied and/or invisible to conscious acknowledgement.

Even when overt political, social and educational efforts seek to combat prejudice and racism, the imbalances of power are so pervasively present within society, opposing equality. Whether consciously recognized or not, equality necessitates relinquishing some of the privilege from which "white" people currently benefit.

Rights cannot exist in individual isolation: a person alone on a desert island has no rights, simply because there is nobody else to accept and act on the corresponding responsibilities. Rights only exist when there are people in interaction, where rights and responsibilities are collectively realized and acted out (Ife & Fiske, 2006, p. 301).

Accordingly, equality and anti-racism directly threaten the privileged position of "whites" who would otherwise have to concede a responsibility in ensuring equal rights for everyone. Although threat theories discussing inclusive attitudes speak of symbolic or real threats to the attitude holder, they do not label or confront the issues of power and privilege as the target for threat.

In light of this dialogue, and the resistance to acknowledge and dismantle the power structures that secure privilege, "inclusion" even at the best of times is an imposturous feat, merely a smokescreen for real equality. If "whites" are not willing to take responsibility for extending equal rights, the "inclusion" gained is a façade.

Over time, Canadian Society may become more inclusive of diverse communities, conferring full 'citizenship' and inclusion and participation in the 'public' realm; however, this

may only occur coincident with a particular community's assimilation and acceptance of mainstream views (Caragata, 1999).

This depicts inclusion with an agenda to preserve dominant power; inclusion conditional upon assimilation to "white" norms.

Since a large component of this research entailed education, it is worth discussing how education fits with a discussion about power and privilege. Education was examined in light of its likeliness to represent a forum that contributes towards more inclusive attitudes; therefore, certain qualities and components of education were examined.

Schools are public and political arenas that reproduce power imbalances and social inequalities (Dei, 1999). By not assessing the qualities of diverse students' experiences within education systems, this research overlooked opportunities to better understand the impact of power and privilege as experienced by racialized groups.

Dei et al. (2004) present an anecdote where Nisha Karumanchery-Luik recounts a personal experience during her Grade 7 school year when her teacher gathered everyone together. Nisha explains, "He said that he was told that he *had* to discuss racism with the class. He rolled his eyes." Nisha was the only person of colour in the class, and her teacher then put her on the spot by asking her whether she has encountered racism. Nisha, was aware of another student grinning at her, a student who frequently referred to her as a "smelly Paki"; she was ridiculed in this moment, and simply said "No" (Dei et al., 2004, p. 59).

Nisha's experience simply illustrates how the existence of a program or policy does not affirm its content. Despite curriculum changes etc., those responsible for

teaching can overtly or subtly communicate their own biases; these in turn can impact one's experiences, and presumably one's attitudes. Dei et al. (2004) query rolling teacher eyes or their obvious political stances for the meaning these convey, both upholding privilege to majority students and reinforcing oppression for minorities.

Within this study, the same query can be applied to the finding that High School Instruction seemed to have a negative effect on inclusive attitudes. In addition to the explanations previously offered, the manner in which such instruction was presented by teachers, and the explicit or implicit biases that may have been evident to students may likely impact attitudes, for majority students, and also create painful experiences, such as the one illustrated above, for ethnic and racial minorities within the classroom.

Additionally, one can revisit the finding that Ethnic and Racial Teachers at University were predictive of negative attitudes. While the discussion above hints at the sense of personal threat students may have experienced, perhaps a more accurate discussion would identify majority or "white" power and privilege as central substances of the threat. Experiencing an ethnic and/or racial professor may inspire rebellion in attitude because a place of authority and prestige, unspokenly reserved for "white" individuals has been occupied by an "other"; this contradicts the normal power structure, and can be internalized as a deeply rooted personal threat. Taking this approach is less comfortable and more likely to stir up visceral reactions and offense. Yet, the distinction between threat experienced regarding a discrete object or experience, such as a particular job, versus the threat to a pervasive regime that perpetuates "white" privilege, is significant. In this sense, research that fails to explore power and privilege, including this project, misses the mark.

Even the positive finding that friendship is positively related to inclusive attitudes can be scrutinized according to the forces of power that may characterize the formation and quality of friendships. Conceivably, friendship can be thought of as a transaction of power. For example, friendships have been thought to be a mechanism through which interethnic boundaries are blurred, but what if the very blurring of these boundaries is for the gain of dominant ethnic and racial groups? If inclusion is conditional upon a group's assimilation and acceptance of mainstream views (Caragata, 1999), then friendships too may be qualified by this condition. If true, even friendship reflects a sacrifice of cultural identity and customs, for the purpose of preserving dominant values. Accordingly, friendship experiences for a "white" person may merely be evaluated based on the degree to which "others" became more like *them*, however likely this would not be recognized, as the outplay of privilege is seldom noticed by the dominant party. Conversely, for minorities, even the pursuit of friendship and longing to 'fit in' could relay a message of cultural and personal inadequacy. Such discussion launches forward, quite far beyond contact theories, even those that address friendship in simple forms. Research has yet to explore the transactional nature of interethnic friendships and how this impacts inclusion within society.

Taken together, do these discussions mean that examining education or other public spheres in an effort to improve inclusive attitudes is futile? No. Education is not just a location for oppression to be acted out and experienced, but it is also a force of emancipation (Dei, 1999, p. 153). Research should focus attention towards ethnic majority students and teachers in order to transform current power differentials; there is a need for better understanding about how education and other social systems reproduce inequality so that we can shift attention towards interventions for ethnic majorities who

perpetuate and tolerate racism (Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1999). A discussion and research focus that acknowledges and seeks to dismantle structures of differential power is long overdue.

Again, as the present study failed to incorporate mechanisms of examining power and privilege within the quantitative measure, and nor did it offer room for qualitative input to expose such factors, it offers little merit in this direction apart from a critical discussion of its limitations in this regard. Intentionally examining power and privilege in future research is advocated.

Final Thoughts

Overall, this research endeavour was marked by several departures from historical and contemporary approaches to examining inclusive attitudes. It revealed the significance of education, predominantly the impact of University qualities and characteristics; additionally it highlighted the importance of early and mid years at Elementary and High School when it comes to the resilient impact of diverse ethnic and racial Friendships. There were two findings that were anticipated to relate to positive attitudes that in fact, revealed negative predictive relationships. These finding revealed that intuitive approaches, particularly within structured education systems do not necessarily achieve the desired outcomes. These point to the need to conduct further research so as not to inadvertently reinforce negative stereotypes and attitudes when the intention is to foster inclusiveness. And finally, the correlations between Faith Group participation and inclusive attitudes reminds us of the social capital gains achieved by grassroots forms of community. The findings from this research break away from the trends in researching prejudice and racism, and instead support directions that seek to

uncover methods of intervening throughout social systems in order to foster inclusive attitudes.

Examining inclusive attitudes is a complex challenge. Various competing theories explore internal dimensions, political climates, presence of and quality of contact etc. Regardless of the approach taken, this research seems to support the notion that experiences occurring within various social systems relate differently with inclusive attitudes; albeit, many of the findings pertaining to different social systems can to a degree be discussed with respect to the current literature surrounding inclusive attitudes. However, how and why certain systems relate differently is not known. If these findings, especially given the low strength of relationships, amount to generalizable trends in attitude, there is much research that needs to be done to gain a better understanding. Clearly, qualitative research adds invaluable context to understanding the substance of individuals' experiences. Quantitative research however, offers means of generalizing findings; perhaps mixed-methods approaches should be explored.

Finally, from a social work perspective, central to the pursuit of approaching and interpreting future studies and interventions pertaining to inclusive attitudes, should be the underlying acknowledgement of power differentials created by ethnicity and race, and, efforts to redress them.

Appendix I

INCLUSIVE ATTITUDES TOWARD NEWCOMERS AND RACIAL MINORITIES WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY

A Systems Theory Examination of Factors Related to Inclusive Attitudes Towards Newcomers and Racial Minorities

Shannon A. Travis

My name is Shannon Travis and I am Masters of Social Work student at Wilfrid Laurier University, with Dr. Martha Kuwee Kumsa as my collaborative advisor. I am inviting you to participate in my thesis research examining factors related to inclusive attitudes towards newcomers and racial minorities. I am interested in your opinions regarding diversity, immigration, and your personal experiences with people from different ethnic/racial backgrounds. This project is intended to provide a better understanding of the relationship between individuals' personal experiences, and their perceptions of immigration and racial/ethnic groups. All Canadian citizens and permanent residents age 16 and older are eligible to participate in this study.

INFORMATION - Participation in this project involves the completion of this online survey. The survey will ask you questions about your education and community experiences, as well as your experiences with people from different backgrounds than yourself. Throughout the following web pages you will be asked to respond to several statements about your interactions with people from different backgrounds, and other topics relating to multiculturalism. Please respond using the rating scales which have been provided. It is important that you respond honestly. This questionnaire should take you 15-20 minutes to complete.

RISKS- Some of the questions contained within this questionnaire are of a personal nature. As a result, there is a slight chance that you may feel uncomfortable when responding to a few questions. This is normal. My contact details are below, should you wish to discuss any adverse effects you experience as a participant.

BENEFITS - This research project is intended to provide a better understanding of the relationship between individuals' personal experiences, and their perceptions about immigration and racial/ethnic groups.

CONFIDENTIALITY - Your responses and personal identity will remain completely anonymous. Between 200-700 participants will complete this questionnaire. I will have no way of knowing whose responses I am reviewing. There is no way of pairing an individual's contact information with their survey responses and at no point during interpretation or analysis of responses will you be personally identified. By completing and submitting this questionnaire you acknowledge permission for your responses to be analyzed by myself or a member of my thesis committee and included in any publication or research presentation. Only aggregate data will be used in the write-up and presentation and no individual responses will ever be presented. Your consent will

be requested prior to beginning the survey. All data will be securely kept and maintained by the primary researcher for five years post-publication, after which it will be destroyed. We recommend that you complete the survey in a private place where others cannot view your responses. We also cannot guarantee security of information while it is transmitted by Internet.

COMPENSATION - For participating in this study you will be eligible to receive one of five \$50 cash prizes to be awarded through random draw of questionnaire respondents. After completing the survey, you will be redirected to another site to submit your contact details for participation in the draw; this way, your personal information will not be collected with your survey responses. I will have no way of pairing your answers with your personal identity. Winners will be notified on or before April 1, 2009, by phone or by email and will be mailed a cheque afterward. Personal information will be destroyed immediately following the selection of winners. Should you decide to withdraw from the research, simply click "Exit this Survey" and you will be redirected to the prize draw entry form.

CONTACT - If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, (or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study) you may contact the researcher, Shannon Travis, at trav1450@wlu.ca , or (905) 317-7189. You may also contact Dr. Martha Kumsa, project supervisor, at mkumsa@wlu.ca or (519) 884-1970 ext. 5227. This project has been reviewed and approved by the University Research Ethics Board. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Bill Marr, Chair, University Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884-0710, extension 2468.

PARTICIPATION - Canadian citizens and permanent residents age 16 and older may participate in this study. Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled; you can still be entered into the prize draw by submitting your information on the prize draw link. If at any point you do not wish to continue, simply click "Exit this survey" in the top right corner of any page, and you will automatically be redirected to the prize draw entry form. Only data from completed surveys will be analyzed. You have the right to omit any questions you choose.

FEEDBACK AND PUBLICATION - The results of this research will be used for the completion of my Master's Thesis requirements and for any related presentations or publications. You can obtain a copy of the results of this research by contacting me; results are expected by April 2009.

I have read and understand the above information. I am 16 years of age or older and I agree to participate in this study.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Appendix II

Attitudes Toward Immigration							
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements, using the following 7 point scale where 1 means "totally disagree" and 7 means "totally agree".	Totally Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Totally Agree
Canadian children growing up surrounded by people of different ethnic backgrounds will be left without a solid cultural base. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I feel secure when I am with people of different ethnic backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Immigration tends to threaten Canadian culture. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
With more immigration Canadian people would lose their identity. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
If more immigrants come to Canada, there would be more unemployment. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
We will all benefit from the increased economic activity created by immigrants.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Immigrants take jobs away from other Canadian people. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The presence of immigrants will not make wages lower. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
There is no reason to think that our country is falling apart because of having a variety of ethnocultural groups.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Immigration increases the level of crime in Canada. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Immigration increases social unrest here. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tolerance/Prejudice							
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements, using the following 7 point scale where 1 means "totally disagree" and 7 means "totally agree".	Totally Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Totally Agree
It is a bad idea for people of different races/ethnicities to marry one another. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Immigrants/ethnics living here should not push themselves where they are not wanted. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
If employers only want to hire certain groups of people, that's their business. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It makes me angry when I hear immigrants/ethnics demanding the same rights as Canadian citizens. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Immigrants/ethnics should have as much to say about the future of Canada as people who were born and raised here.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is good to have people from different ethnic and racial groups living in the same country.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
We should promote equality among all groups, regardless of racial or ethnic origin.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Some people are just inferior to others. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on others. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

If people were treated more equally we would have fewer problems in this country.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
It is important that we treat other countries as equals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Elementary School								
Please indicate the number of years you attended elementary school?								
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements, using the following 7 point scale where 1 means "totally disagree" and 7 means "totally agree".	Totally Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Totally Agree	Do Not Remember
My elementary school teachers represented a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My elementary school courses offered instruction about different countries and cultures.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My elementary school participated in cross-cultural experiences, such as multicultural celebrations, guest speakers from other countries/cultures, field trips to cultural locations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
The students in my elementary school represented a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My personal peer group (friends) at elementary school represented a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My personal peer group (friends) at elementary school represented individuals from marginalized groups, such as handicapped or homosexual?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
High School								
Please indicate the number of years you attended high school?								
Did you participate in a voluntary exchange program to another country during high school?	Yes	No						
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements, using the following 7 point scale where 1 means "totally disagree" and 7 means "totally agree".	Totally Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Totally Agree	Do Not Remember
My secondary school teachers represented a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My secondary school courses offered instruction about different countries and cultures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My secondary school participated in cross-cultural experiences, such as multicultural celebrations, guest speakers from other countries/cultures, field trips to cultural locations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My secondary school courses incorporated literature or film material from foreign authors or producers, and representing foreign themes?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
The students in my high school represented a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

My personal peer group (friends) at high school represented a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My personal peer group (friends) at high school represented individuals from marginalized groups, such as handicapped or homosexual?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
College								
Please indicate the number of years you attended college?								
Did you participate in a voluntary exchange program to another country during college, or attend college within another country?	Yes		No					
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements, using the following 7 point scale where 1 means "totally disagree" and 7 means "totally agree".	Totally Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Totally Agree	Do Not Remember
My college professors represented a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My college courses offered instruction about different countries and cultures.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My college participated in cross-cultural experiences, such as multicultural celebrations, guest speakers from other countries/cultures, field trips to cultural locations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My college courses incorporated literature or film material from foreign authors or producers, and representing foreign themes?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
The students in my college represented a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My personal peer group (friends) at college represented a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My personal peer group (friends) at college represented individuals from marginalized groups, such as handicapped or homosexual?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
University								
Please indicate the number of years you attended university (including postgraduate studies)?								
Did you participate in a voluntary exchange program to another country during university, or attend university within another country?	Yes		No					
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements, using the following 7 point scale where 1 means "totally disagree" and 7 means "totally agree".	Totally Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Totally Agree	Do Not Remember
My university professors represented a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

My university courses offered instruction about different countries and cultures.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My university participated in cross-cultural experiences, such as multicultural celebrations, guest speakers from other countries/cultures, field trips to cultural locations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My university courses incorporated literature or film material from foreign authors or producers, and representing foreign themes?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
The students in my university represented a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My personal peer group (friends) at university represented a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My personal peer group (friends) at university represented individuals from marginalized groups, such as handicapped or homosexual.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Community								
Do you regularly attend/hold membership at a faith based community group? (i.e. church, synagogue, mosque)	Yes	No						
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements, using the following 7 point scale where 1 means "totally disagree" and 7 means "totally agree".	Totally Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Totally Agree	Do Not Remember
The people within my faith community represent a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My personal friends within my faith community represent a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My personal friends within my faith community represent individuals from marginalized groups, such as handicapped or homosexual.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Do you belong to a community volunteer organization? (i.e. Rotary Club, SPCA, MADD)	Yes	No						
The people within my volunteer group represent a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My personal friends within my faith community represent a variety of different racial/ethnic backgrounds other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My personal friends within my faith community represent individuals from marginalized groups, such as handicapped or homosexual.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Demographic								
Finally, I would like to ask you some questions about yourself. Again, you will never be personally identified in this research project or in any presentation or publication. The information you provide will be coded by number only. This information will be used for statistical purposes only.								

What is your age? _____ years

Are you (a) male or (b) female (please circle)?

In which country were you born?

If you were not born in Canada, how long have you lived in
Canada? _____ years

How would you describe your ethnic identity?

What is the ethnic background of your (list up to 3 for each parent):

Father: _____, _____, _____

Mother: _____, _____, _____

Are you currently married? Yes____, No _____

References

- Aberson, C.L., Shoemaker, C. & Tomolillo, C. (2004). Implicit Bias and Contact: The role of interethnic friendships. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 144, 3, 335-347.
- Alexander, J.C. (1990). Beyond the epistemological dilemma: general theory in a postpositivist mode. *Sociological Forum*, 5,4, 531-544.
- Blake, D. E. (2003). Environmental determinants of racial attitudes among white Canadians. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 36, 491-509.
- Bannerji, H. (1996). On the dark side of the nation: Politics of multiculturalism and the state of Canada. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 31, 88-124.
- Berry, J. (2006). Mutual attitudes among immigrants and ethnocultural groups in Canada. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 719-734.
- Berry, J.W. & Kalin, R.(1995). Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991 national survey. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 27, 301-320.
- Berry, J.W., Kalin, R. & Taylor (1977).Multiculturalism and ethnic attitudes in Canada. Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- Bratt, C. (2005). The Structure of Attitudes Toward Non-Western Immigrant Groups: Second-order factor analysis of attitudes among Norwegian adolescents. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 8, 4, 447-469.
- Boulding, K.E. (1956). General systems theory – the skeleton of science. *Management Science*, 2, 3, 197-208.
- Caragata, L. (1999). The privileged public: who is permitted citizenship? *Community Development Journal*, 34, 4, 270-286.
- Case, C., Breely, M., & Fuchs, S. (1989). Social determinants of racial prejudice. *Sociological Perspectives*, 32,4,469-483.
- Crawley, H. (2005). Evidence on Attitudes to Asylum and Immigration: What we know, don't know and need to know. *Centre of Migration, Policy and Society: Working Paper no. 23*, University of Oxford.
- Crossan, F. (2003). Research philosophy: Towards an understanding. *Nurse Research*, 11, 1, 46-55.
- Dei, G.J.S. (1999). The denial of difference: reframing anti-racist praxis. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 2, 1, 17-37.

- Dei, G.S., Karumanchery, L.L., Karumanchery-Luik, N. (2004). *Playing the race card: Exposing white power and privilege*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc. Chapter 3, 59-80.
- Dominelli, L. (1996). Deprofessionalizing social work: Anti-oppressive practice, competencies and postmodernism. *British Journal of Social Work*, 26, 153-175.
- Dovido, J.F., Kawakami, K., Johnson, C., Johnson, B. & Howard, A. (1997). On the Nature of Prejudice: Automatic and controlled processes. *Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology*, 35, 510-540.
- Dumbrill, G.C. (2003). *Child Welfare: AOP's Nemesis?* In Wes Shera (Ed.) (2003). *Emerging Perspectives on Anti-Oppressive Practice*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.
- Esses, V.M., Dovido, J.F., & Hodson, G. (2002). Public attitudes toward immigration in the United States and Canada in response to the September 11, 2001 "Attack on America". *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 2002, 69-85.
- Esses, V.M., Dovido, J.F., Jackson, L.M., & Armstrong, T.L. (2001) The immigration dilemma: The role of perceived group competition, ethnic prejudice and national identity. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 389-412.
- Esses, V.M., Wagner, U., Wolf, C., Preiser, M., & Wilbur, C.J. (2006). Perceptions of national identity and attitudes toward immigration in Canada and Germany. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 653-669.
- Etzioni, A. (1982). The refugees controversy: federal 'involvement' of voluntary agencies. *The Public Interest*, 68, 92.
- Forbes H D. (2004). Ethnic conflict and the contact hypothesis. The psychology of ethnic and cultural conflict. An imprint of Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc, 2004. 69-82
- Forder, A. (1976). Social Work and Systems Theory. *British Journal of Social Work*, 6, 1, 23-42.
- Fortin, J. & Loewen, P.J. (2004). Prejudice and Asymmetrical Opinion Structures: Public opinion toward immigration in Canada. For presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, June 3-5, 2004.
- George, U., Lee, B., McGrath, S. & Moffat, K. (2003). Exploring citizenship in contemporary community work practice. *Journal of Community Practice*, 11, 71-86.
- Guess, T, J. (2006). The social construction of whiteness: racism by intent, racism by consequence. *Critical Sociology*, 32, 4, 649-673.
- Harrison, F. V. (1995). The persistent power of "race" in the cultural and political economy of racism. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, 47-74.

- Heaven, P.C.L., St. Quintin, D. (2001). Personality Factors Predict Racial Prejudice. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34, 625-634.
- Ife, J. & Fiske, L. (2006). Human rights and community work. *International Social Work*, 49, 3, 297-308.
- Jones, F.E. & Lambert, W.E. (1959-60). Attitudes Toward Immigrants in a Canadian Community. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 23, 4, 537-546.
- Jones, F.E. & Lambert, W.E. (1967). Some situational influences on attitudes toward immigrants. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 18, 408-424.
- Kalin, R. (1996). Ethnic attitudes as a function of ethnic presence. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 28, 3, 171.
- Kalin, R. & Berry, J.W. (1996). Interethnic attitudes in Canada: ethnocentrism, consensual hierarchy and reciprocity. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 28, 4, 253-261.
- Lamont, M. & Molnar, V. (2002) The study of boundaries in social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 167-195.
- Larsen, L., Harlan, S.L., Bolin, B., Hackett, E.J., Hope, D., Kirby, A., Nelson, A., Rex, T.R. & Wolf, S. (2004). Bonding and bridging: understanding the relationship between social capital and civic action. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24, 64-77.
- Leong, C.-H. (2006). Cultural values and attitudes toward immigrants and multiculturalism: The case of the Eurobarometer survey on racism and xenophobia. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 799-810.
- Lewis-Beck, M., Bryman, A. E., Liao, T. F. (eds.) *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*. Vol 1. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- MacKinnon, D. P., Krull, J. L., & Lockwood, C. M. (2000). Equivalence of the mediation, confounding, and suppression effect. *Prevention Science*, 1, 173-181.
- Neuman, W.L. & Kreuger, L.W. (2003) *Social work research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Palmer, D. L. (1996). Determinants of Canadian attitudes toward immigration: More than just racism? *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 28, 3, 180-192.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (1998). Intergroup Contact Theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65-85.
- Pratto, F., & Lemieux, A.F. (2001). The psychological ambiguity of immigration and its implications for promoting immigration policy. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 413-430.

- Ratcliffe, P. (1999). 'Race', education and the discourse of 'exclusion': a critical research note. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 2, 1, 1149-155.
- Reeves, E.B. & Bylund, R.A. (1989). Social density and public ritual in non-industrial communities: A cross-cultural analysis. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 30, 2, 225-244.
- Robbins, S. P., Chatterjee, P., & Canda, E. R. (1997). *Contemporary human behavior theory: A critical perspective for social work*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Russell, C.J., Pinto, J.K., & Bobko, P. (1991). Appropriate moderated regression and inappropriate research strategy: A demonstration of information loss due to scale coarseness. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 15, 3, 256-266.
- Rubin, A. & Babbie, E. (2007). *Essential research methods for social work*. Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- Saleebey, D. (2001). *Human behavior and social environments: a biopsychosocial approach*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Seidman, E. (1988). Back to the future, community psychology: Unfolding a theory of social intervention. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16, 1, 3-24.
- Siraj-Blatchford, I, & Siraj-Blatchford, J. (1999). 'Race' research and reform: the impact of the three Rs on anti-racist pre-school and primary education in the UK. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 2, 1, 127-148.
- Sobczak, M. (2007). Attitudes toward immigrants and immigration in the United States: Toward a structural approach. SAS Global Forum, 2007.
- Speer, P.W. & Hughey, J. (1995). Community organizing: An ecological route to empowerment and power. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, 5, 1995.
- Stephan, W.G., Ybarra, O., Martinez, C., Scharzwald, J., & Tur-Kapsa (1998). Prejudice towards immigrants to Spain and Israel: An integrated threat theory analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29, 559-576.
- Stephan, W.G., Renfro, C.L., Esses, V.M., Stephan, C.W., & Martin, T. (2005). The effects of feeling threatened on attitudes toward immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural relations*, 29, 1-19.
- Stier, R. (2007). Anti-oppressive research in social work: A preliminary discussion. *British Journal of Social Work*, 37, 857-871.
- Staral, J.M. (2000). Building on mutual goals: the intersection of community practice and church-based organizing. *Journal of Community Practice*, 7, 3, 85-95.

- Taft, R. (1953). The Shared Frame of Reference Concept Applied to the Assimilation of Immigrants. *Human Relations*, 6, 44-55.
- Verkuyten, M. (2004). Everyday ways of thinking about multiculturalism. *SAGE Publications*, 4, 53-74.
- Ward, C., & Masgoret, A.-M. (2006). An integrative model of attitudes toward immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 671-682.
- Ward, D. & Mullender, A. (1991). Empowerment and oppression: An indissoluble pairing for contemporary social work. *Critical Social Policy*, X, 21-29.
- Yegidis, B.L., & Weinbach, R. W. (1996). *Research Methods for Social Workers*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.