

Ethnic Identity and the Labour Market

Krishna Pendakur and Ravi Pendakur¹

Abstract

We examine the consequences of ethnic identity on getting a job. We define ethnic identity as the attachment to the group who shares one's ancestral heritage, and use a direct measure of the depth of ethnic identity based on a survey question which asks "is your ethnic origin very important to you, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important". This measure is used to explore how ethnic identity affects two labour market processes often presumed to depend on it: the use of informal networks to find jobs, and the quality of jobs found. We find that for European ethnic minorities, the depth of ethnic identity is positively correlated with the propensity to use informal methods to find jobs. This is consistent with ethnic identity playing a role in ethnically based job-finding networks. We find also that for visible minority men, ethnic identity is correlated with much lower occupational prestige. This is consistent with ethnic identity being correlated with behaviour that serves to separate ethnic minorities from majority populations.

¹ Corresponding author: Krishna Pendakur, Department of Economics, Simon Fraser University, pendakur@sfu.ca; and Ravi Pendakur, Strategic Directions Branch, Social Development Canada. Krishna Pendakur acknowledges the financial support of the Center for Excellence on Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis and of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research. The authors wish to acknowledge the intellectual support of our colleagues on this work: George Akerlof, Edward Glaeser, Rachel Kranton, Brian Krauth, Ted Miguel, Clyde Reed and Dick Stanley.

1. Introduction

Identity as a social concept is a person's belief that he or she belongs to a social group, such as an extended family, a tribe, a nation, a religious, ethnic or linguistic minority. Belonging, in any meaningful sense, implies that the person adheres to the group's established behavioural prescriptions and accepts the obligations owing to the group (Akerlof and Kranton, 2000). Such prescriptions include both observable behaviour and interpretive protocols (Kuper, 2000).

People cannot thrive alone in the world. They need to cooperate with others to survive. Therefore they must enter into more or less long term relationships of rights and obligations with others. In other words, they must have an identity. With an identity, a person gets the security of knowing how to act properly (i.e., gain the group's approval) and the right to draw on the resources of the group. An identity gives a person a more or less coherent and efficient set of rules to live by and the conceptual tools for developing strategies to maximize well-being (Swidler, 1998; Akerlof and Kranton, 2000), although not necessarily or even primarily economic well-being. Indeed, in maintaining or adopting an identity, one may trade off economic gain for social reassurance (that one is behaving correctly, and will be justly rewarded or at least treated fairly) and the recognition or political power and protection that it brings (Portes, 1998). Taking a holistic view, economically irrational behaviour may be quite rational (Akerlof and Kranton, 2000, Bernard, 1999).

With rare exceptions, therefore, everyone has an identity, whether it is the one bequeathed as a matter of duty to one by one's parents or one adopted subsequently. Indeed, some people have multiple identities and those identities may even be in conflict with one another. In modern, liberal, multi-cultural democracies in particular, people, especially immigrants and

members of unassimilated sub-groups are confronted with a multiplicity of choices of identities (Hall, 1992; Appadurai, 1990). Their choices (or the choices of their parents) can have important consequences for their welfare because the behavioural prescriptions of the groups to which they identify will condition the choices they make in all aspects of their lives, social, economic and otherwise.

The social sciences have studied many of these consequences of identity, particularly in political science, history and sociology (Hall, 1992; Kuper 2000). However, the economic consequences of identity choice have been little studied, although they may be of great importance. In this paper, we examine the consequences of identity choice on one of the most critical areas of economic welfare and life success, getting a job. The particular type of identity attachment we study is ethnic identity, which we define as the attachment to the group who shares one's ancestral heritage.

Using a new Canadian dataset, we explore how a direct measure of the depth of ethnic identity at the individual level is correlated with the type of network used to find jobs, and with the quality of jobs actually found. Our main contribution is to use direct information on the depth of ethnic identity from a survey question, rather than an indirect measure such as neighbourhood composition or ethnic origin, and explore its relationship with labour market choices.

2. Ethnic Identity

Ethnic identity is a particularly significant type of identity. Ethnicity is defined as the sharing of a common natal origin or common ancestors, and so having the right and obligation to belong to their culture. It is at best a fuzzy concept. There is little agreement on how far back to go in the definition of ancestry, or which parts of one's lineage should be counted. Nonetheless, we may still

think of ethnic identity as the feeling of belonging a person has to their ancestral group. People are frequently seen as having multiple identities, but the identity with a person's ancestral group(s) can be particularly important because it may be ascribed at birth or in childhood and it is usually reinforced by physical characteristics (e.g., skin colour) or cultural practices (e.g., language, religion).

Social scientists argue that identity is multidimensional and therefore unidimensional means of categorizing identity are inappropriate. In general terms, however, we follow Rothschild (1981) in defining ethnicity in terms of a group's distinctiveness depending on the following criteria:

1. Self-categorization as a means of identifying both group members and non-members;
2. Shared descent: a notion of history that suggests commonality;
3. Specific cultural traits such as custom or language; and
4. Social organizations for interaction both within the group and with people outside the group.

In our data (described fully in section 4), these categories will help us establish the validity of our self-reported direct measure of the depth of ethnic identity. In particular, ethnic identity based on these criteria suggests that the more group traits a person has, the more likely it is that ethnic identity will be an important feature in that person's life. Thus, someone who speaks a heritage language, has many group contacts, and goes to a minority church is more likely to think that ethnicity is an important part of his or her identity than someone who does not have these characteristics.

Focusing on the effect of ethnic identity on labour market outcomes is a reasonably new strategy in the economics literature. Labour economists have studied extensively the effects of ethnic origin but they have studied the effects of ethnic identity almost not at all. For example, we know that non-white ethnic minorities in Canada and the USA earn less than their white counterparts

(see for example: Chandra 2003; Pendakur and Pendakur 1998, 2002). However, we do not know much about how the depth of ethnic identity affects the economic choices and constraints faced by ethnic minorities. For example, Fryer and Levitt (2003) show that, taking the distinctiveness of a woman's first name as a measure of the depth of her Black identity, long-run life outcomes are not very correlated with the depth of identity. Identities are chosen by individuals, but generally names are not. Name distinctiveness, therefore, may be correlated only weakly with identity, if at all. Fryer and Levitt (2003) acknowledge therefore that not finding a correlation, does not constitute compelling evidence that identity does not matter. Antecol and Cobb-Clark (2004) take the composition of friendship-, socialisation- and co-worker-groupings as a measure of ethnic identity, and show that it is correlated with the incidence of racially-based harassment. Although these measures of identity are choice variables which presumably depend on identity, they remain indirect measures.

The strategy of correlating a direct measure of the strength of identity with some aspect of behaviour is quite unusual in the economics literature. To our knowledge, the only paper pursuing this strategy is Battu, Mwale and Zenou (2005) whose study of British micro-data finds strong correlations between a direct measure of identity and the probability of being employed. Empirical social science research outside economics has also favoured indirect measures of the strength of ethnic identity over direct measures. Notable exceptions are Bedolla (2000, 2003) wherein the depth of ethnic identity is found to be correlated with political and voting behaviour among Hispanic youth in Los Angeles.

The direct measure of the depth of a person's ethnic identity used in this paper is based on a survey question asking "is your ethnic origin very important to you, somewhat important, not very

important or not at all important”. We examine how this measure of the depth of ethnic identity correlates with the probability that people find jobs through informal network connections, and with the quality of the jobs actually found.

3. Ethnic Identity and the Labour Market

A rich literature in economic sociology suggests that jobs are often found through personal connections and informal networks (see, especially, Granovetter 1995, 2002). To the extent that the attachment to an ethnic identity leads to participation in ethnic social groups, ethnic identity may be an important element of access to ethnically-based job networks. If this is the case, then the depth of ethnic identity should be correlated with the use of informal job-finding networks for those ethnic minorities who live in cities with large numbers of co-ethnics. However, this correlation should be weaker for those ethnic minorities who live in cities with only small numbers of co-ethnics.

In this paper, we can measure directly whether or not people whose ethnic identity is important to them have a greater probability of using informal networks to find jobs than other people do. Further, we are able to assess whether or not the strength of this effect varies with the number of co-ethnics present in the respondent’s city of residence.

The importance of ethnic identity to a person may also influence his or her desire to be involved in ethnically-based social groups. If this is the case, people with strong ethnic identity may desire to work among co-ethnics, and indeed be willing to pay something for the privilege. This would result in people with strong ethnic identity accepting jobs which ‘seem’ to be of low quality, but which in fact have the compensating feature of being within a valued ethnic enclave.

Of course, just as ethnicity may be correlated with job quality for reasons having to do with labour market discrimination, so too might ethnic identity. Ethnic identity may act as a social divider

which, may exacerbate any discrimination they face in labour markets. If this is the case, then ethnic minorities with deep ethnic identity would fare worse in labour markets than non-minorities, and worse than ethnic minorities whose ethnicities are not important parts of their identity. In this paper, we measure directly whether or not ethnic identity, as distinct from ethnicity (ancestry), is correlated with job quality, though it is somewhat difficult to distinguish between the two types of explanations.

Battu, Seaman and Zenou (2004) pursue similar questions using British data. They ask whether or not place of birth and years since migration affect the probability that immigrants use informal networks to find jobs. They find that assimilation (read *not deep identity*) is correlated with lower utilisation of informal networks, but observe no real difference in the quality of jobs found. Using our more direct measure of the depth of ethnic identity---which is measurable for both immigrant and native-born persons---generates similar results. However, our data allow us to extend the analysis in two important directions: the influence of co-ethnic populations and the relevance of ethnic identity for European origin minorities . Deep ethnic identity seems to increase the use of informal job-finding networks only if the local population of co-ethnics is large. Further, deep ethnic identity seems to be correlated with job quality only for visible minorities and not for European minorities.

Battu, Mwale and Zenou (2005) propose a model of ‘oppositional identities’, defined in opposition to dominant white ethnicity. The choice of identity in their model is thus the choice of adopting the majority cultural identity. Their empirical measure of the depth of oppositional identity is based on survey questions similar to ours. They find that those non-white people who adopt oppositional (read nonwhite) identities are less likely to be employed than those who do not. Their model and data are framed dichotomously in terms of white or oppositional identity. They do not

explore the consequences of deep identity for Europeans (whites) of non-British origin. However, in a world permeated with racism, the effects of identity versus discrimination for non-white individuals may be difficult to disentangle. But the effects of identity on the behaviour of white individuals may be less polluted by discrimination and therefore easier to understand. Our paper uses an approach and data that are similar in spirit to Battu, Mwale and Zenou (2005), but we do not impose this dichotomous white/nonwhite structure a priori. Rather, we allow the effects of identity to vary between majority white, minority white, non-white and Aboriginal people. We find that the strongest correlations between the depth of ethnic identity and the use of informal job-finding networks are for minorities of European origin, and not for nonwhites.

4. The Data

The Equality, Security and Community Survey is a two-wave national stratified random sample of the Canadian population conducted in 2000 and 2002. The survey is particularly good for looking at issues of ethnic identity and economic outcomes for a number of reasons. First, it contains an over-sample of individuals living in census tracts in Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver with large visible minority populations. Thus, the total number of visible minorities---defined as people of non-European, non-Aboriginal origin---is substantial for a survey of this size. The survey was administered in 2000 to 5,016 respondents and in 2002 to an additional 3,225 respondents. Of the 8,241 observations in total, 1,040 are visible minorities.

Second, the survey has a large and varied set of questions on ethnic identity as well as a number that are designed to measure the importance of ethnic affiliation. There are questions that ask specifically about ethnic background: “To what ethnic or cultural group do you belong?” with the first mention through fourth mention recorded in the data. If the respondent answered “Canadian” as

the first response, a probe question was used to seek additional information: “In addition to being Canadian to what ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestors belong on first coming to this continent?” Thus, as many as four ethnic origin variables are recorded for each respondent.

Given some response other than ‘Canadian’ to the ethnicity question, respondents were probed as to the importance of their ethnicity. Our depth of ethnic identity variable is the 4-valued ordinal response to the question: “Is your ethnic origin very important to you, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important”. We assign a value of 1 to not at all important and a value of 4 to ‘very important’.

Because of the possibility of multiple ethnic origins, ethnicity can be difficult to ‘code up’. We took the responses to the five questions and combined them into a single ethnic categorization, with 68 categories. These 68 ethnic origin categories were chosen to match with city-level ethnic population data, which we use in regressions to measure the potential size of the community of co-ethnics for each respondent. We also divide the 68 ethnic origin categories into 4 broad ethnic origin categories which we use as covariates in regressions: Aboriginal, visible minority, British/French and other European. The first two correspond to Canadian employment equity categories.

Questions are also asked about parents’ place of birth, respondent’s place of birth, home language, religion, and importance of religion. Thus we explore the interrelationships between ethnic origin, ethnic identity, and some of the assumed determinants of ethnic identity arising from the sociological literature on ethnic identity. Other, more ‘demographic’ type information is also available: age, highest level of schooling, household size and size of city of residence. We use these variables as controls in regressions.

We explore two features of labour market outcomes of respondents. In the survey,

respondents were asked both about the characteristics of their current job and the means by which they found their current job. The response ‘through family or friends’ is used as our indicator of finding a job through an informal network. A priori, we expect those whose identity is strongly ethnic to exploit ethnically-based information networks for job-finding more than those who say their ethnic origin is not important. We are able to assess this directly by examining whether or not those with deep ethnic attachment found their job via informal networks with greater frequency than those without deep ethnic attachment. In addition, we are able to evaluate whether the use of informal networks by those with deep ethnic identity is contingent on there being a large population of co-ethnics in their city of residence.

Our measure of job quality is the Blishen score for occupational prestige applied to the respondent’s reported occupation. With it, we are able to ask whether or not those with deep ethnic attachment get jobs of a different quality than those without it.

In a model where ethnic minorities with deep ethnic identity use ethnically-based networks to get jobs, there may be a feedback from the job found to the depth of ethnic identity. For example, workers in ethnic enclaves may find their ethnic identity ‘deepened’ by the experience of enclave work. In this case, job-finding and the depth of ethnic identity are really simultaneously determined. This type of endogeneity would also pollute all those right-hand side variables which are causally correlated with the depth of ethnic identity, for example, the co-ethnic population of the respondent’s city of residence. In the absence of an exogenous instrument correlated with identity, but uncorrelated with the regression disturbance, we caution that results must be interpreted in a reduced-form way. Thus, estimated coefficients on the depth of ethnic identity give the total effect of differences in identity across people, and not the marginal effect of identity for a given person.

5. Results

5.1 The Importance of Ethnicity and Its Correlates

The discussion in section 2 suggested that ethnic identity is correlated with such things as shared language, culture, and history. The survey asks several questions about these things so we are able to correlate them with the reported depth of ethnic identity. This enables us to confirm that the respondents are actually referring to a valid conception of identity when they claim that their ethnic origin is important to them.

Table 1: Importance of Ethnicity by Generation

		Importance of Ethnicity					Mean
		not at all	not very	somewhat	very	Total	
All		12%	18%	41%	29%	7,553	2.87
	born in Canada	14%	20%	43%	23%	4,189	2.74
	2 parents born in Canada	12%	24%	40%	24%	721	2.75
	1 immigrant parent	8%	12%	43%	37%	723	3.08
	Immigrant	9%	13%	35%	42%	1,920	3.11

Table 1 shows the response to the question about the importance of ethnic origin by immigration status. This table covers both the immigration status of the respondent and of their parents. It shows that twelve percent of respondents do not think that ethnicity is important, while more than two-thirds of respondents think that ethnicity is at least somewhat important.

Immigrants and Canadian-born respondents with two immigrant parents are, however, more likely than others to report that their ethnic origin is 'very important'. Forty-two percent of immigrant respondents and 37 percent of those with two immigrant parents think that ethnicity is very important, compared with 24 percent and 23 percent for Canadian-born respondents with one or two Canadian-born parents, respectively. Reported depth of ethnic identity thus correlates in the expected manner with the immigration status of respondents and their parents.

Table 2: Importance of Ethnicity by Home Language

Home Language	not at all	not very	somewhat	very	Total
French in Quebec	13%	17%	41%	29%	1,184
English in Rest of Canada	13%	21%	42%	24%	4,907
Other (all regions)	6%	10%	35%	49%	997
Canadian-born	10%	9%	37%	50%	147
Foreign-born	5%	11%	35%	48%	836

Table 2 shows the response to the same question as it varies with home language. If a respondent speaks a language other than English at home, he or she is more likely to think that ethnicity is important. Half of those whose home language is neither English nor French report that their ethnic origin is ‘very important’ to them. In contrast, only 24 percent of non-Quebec residents whose home language is English feel this way. Of course, home language is highly correlated with immigration status, which may be the driver of ethnic identity. The bottom panel of Table 2 divides those who speak neither English nor French at home into Canadian-born and Foreign-born subgroups, and we see the same pattern. Given that language is an important part of the ethnic ‘package’, this strong correlation is consistent with our prior suppositions.

Table 3: Importance of Ethnicity by Broad Ethnic Origin

Broad Origin Group	not at all	not very	somewhat	very	Total
ALL					
British or French	14%	20%	42%	25%	3,845
Other European	11%	19%	41%	28%	2,547
Visible Minority	6%	11%	36%	47%	1,018
Aboriginal	13%	10%	31%	46%	143
Canadian Born					
British or French	14%	20%	43%	23%	3,457
Other European	11%	22%	43%	24%	1,842
Visible Minority	7%	8%	43%	43%	199

Table 3 shows how the response to the same question varies by broad ethnic origin category. Here, the correlation with broad ethnic category is strong: Visible minority and Aboriginal persons are much more likely to respond that ethnicity is very important. However, given that immigrants are much more likely than Canadian-born people to be visible minority, correlations of the depth of identity with broad ethnic origin group may be contaminated with immigration effects. The bottom panel of Table 3 shows the proportions for Canadian-born respondents, and we see a higher

frequency of ‘very important’ for visible minorities in this sub-population as well.

Our data report responses to a similar question on the importance of religion in the respondent’s life. The “importance of religion” question gives a four-valued ordinal response, which is moderately correlated (correlation coefficient of 0.21) with the ordinal response to the importance of ethnicity.

The above findings are in agreement with those criteria proposed by Rothschild (1981) and others. They support the contention that ethnic identity is a package of related phenomena such as immigrant and aboriginal / visible minority status (ancestry and history), shared language (home language), and shared religion, and that respondents are actually referring to a valid conception of ethnic identity when they claim that their ethnic origin is important to them.

Table 4: Importance of Ethnicity, Ethnic Organisations, Ethnic Friendships, Ethnic Neighbours

	not at all	not very	somewhat	very
Number of Ethnic Organisations				
0	95%	91%	84%	68%
1	3%	6%	10%	18%
2 or more	2%	3%	6%	14%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
% with Non Co-ethnic friends				
All	74%	77%	76%	74%
British or French	73%	76%	67%	67%
Other European	73%	77%	82%	80%
Visible Minority	83%	90%	89%	76%
Aboriginal	60%	50%	86%	89%
% with Non Co-ethnic neighbours				
All	65%	64%	66%	72%
British or French	60%	56%	55%	57%
Other European	70%	70%	74%	80%
Visible Minority	87%	85%	86%	81%
Aboriginal	40%	100%	93%	67%

One of the hypotheses we are trying to test is that the depth of ethnic identity correlates with the probability of using an informal network of co-ethnic persons to find a job. This contention depends for its validity on the degree of association between ethnic identification and the probability that the respondent actually has a connection with an ethnic community. Table 4 shows three

measures of association with an ethnic community: the number of ethnic organisations of which the respondent is a member; whether or not the respondent has a friend outside his or her ethnic group; and whether or not the respondent has a neighbour outside his or her ethnic group. Note that the first correlation is available only for observations from 2000, and the other two are only available for observations from 2002.

The top panel of Table 4 shows that those who report deeper ethnic identity are involved in more ethnically-related organisations. The difference across depth of ethnic identity is large: 14% of those who say their ethnic group is ‘very important’ to them are involved in two or more ethnically based community organisations, whereas only 2% of those who say their ethnic group is ‘not at all’ important to them behave this way. So, at least along this dimension, peoples’ reported depth of ethnic identity is correlated with how well they are connected with their ethnic community.

The middle panel of Table 4 shows the proportions of people who have at least one friend outside their ethnic group. Looking at the sample as a whole, the proportions who have non-co-ethnic friends barely changes across the depth of identity: 74% of those whose ethnic origin is ‘not at all’ important to them have a non-co-ethnic friend, and the same proportion of those whose ethnic origin is ‘very important’ to them have a non-co-ethnic friend. However, when we look at this proportion by broad ethnic grouping, we see that for British/French origin people and visible minorities, the deeper their ethnic identity, the less likely they are to have a non-co-ethnic friend. For Other European and Aboriginal people, the opposite pattern holds. So our direct measure of the depth of ethnic identity is plausibly correlated with friendship connections, but the evidence is not overwhelmingly convincing.

The bottom panel of Table 4 shows the proportions who have neighbours outside their ethnic

group by broad ethnic group and depth of ethnic identity. Here, we see the same pattern as with friendship connections---the expected pattern is evident for British/French origin people and visible minority people, but not for other population groups.

In sum, we feel that our direct measure of the depth of ethnic identity is valid on the a priori sociological grounds of correlations with language, immigration generation and religion. Furthermore, a strong identification with ethnic identity appears to affect some observable choice including choice of voluntary organisations, friendships and neighbours.

We can now turn to the examination of our main hypotheses that a person’s depth of ethnic identity correlates with the probability that he or she find jobs through informal network connections, and with the quality of the job actually found.

5.2 The Importance of Ethnicity and Job-Finding

Table 5 shows the frequencies of responses for a question about how the respondent’s present job was found

Table 5: How did Respondents find their jobs

		number	%
All		4,222	100%
Formal	Employment centre	112	3%
	Union / Other posting	190	5%
	Prior employment	173	4%
	Recruitment (employer or agency)	332	8%
	Application/Resume	515	12%
	Help wanted ad/ news story	551	13%
	News story	86	2%
Informal/ Network	Knew someone—Family or friend	1,232	29%
	Knew someone---other	419	10%
Other	Internet	118	3%
	Other	494	12%

Of the people who responded, almost 40 percent said they found out about their present job through an informal network. Five percent said they found out through a posting (either union or

other) and 16 percent said they found out through the media. The modal means of finding out about a job was through friends or relatives.

We have a number of hypotheses related to the use of networks and the importance of ethnicity. First, ethnic networks should matter, but only if your ethnic origin is important to you. This hypothesis is about an interaction between ethnic identity and the presence of a large community of co-ethnics in the respondent’s city of residence. Second, the importance of ethnic networks might be different for different ethnic groups. In particular, we do not expect to see much going on in the English/French group, because this grouping is the majority or plurality in almost every city in Canada. We use Table 6 to motivate the regressions below. Here, the percentages in each cell indicate the proportion of that category of respondent that used a family or friend connection to learn about their current job. The table displays the population by broad ethnic origin, and divides the ethnic origins into sex, whether or not respondents have many or few co-ethnics living in their city and importance of ethnicity. Here, ‘many’ is defined as more than the median co-ethnic population size within each broad ethnic origin category.

Table 6: Probability of Finding Jobs through Family and Friends, by Broad Ethnicity, Importance of Ethnicity and Coethnic Population

Coethnic Population	Importance of Ethnicity	Broad Ethnic Origin			
		Eng or French	Other European	Visible Minority	Aboriginal
Males					
few coethnics	not 'very important'	26%	27%	27%	63%
	very important'	33%	19%	43%	43%
many coethnics	not 'very important'	28%	31%	27%	50%
	very important'	33%	36%	38%	17%
Females					
few coethnics	not 'very important'	22%	27%	17%	14%
	very important'	23%	30%	31%	13%
many coethnics	not 'very important'	24%	21%	23%	7%
	very important'	27%	30%	41%	22%

The relevant comparison for our hypotheses is: does living in a community with many or few co-ethnics make a difference in job finding approach for those with deep ethnic identity? Among

males, this is only the case for people of ‘other European’ origin, and among females this is only the case for visible minorities (these comparisons are indicated in **bold**). For both males and females, there is hardly any difference within the majority British/French origin group. The converse of our hypothesis is that the presence of co-ethnics should not matter for those without deep ethnic identity. This seems roughly true in the table. Below, we show that the finding is robust to the inclusion of covariates in the model.

We estimate linear probability models on whether or not a job was found through an informal ‘family or friend’ network separately for males and for females. The models include the following controls (reported in the Appendix): 19 dummies for province and year and their interactions, 3 home language dummies, 10 education level dummies, 2 continuous variables for age and age squared, and 7 household size dummies. Right-hand side variables of interest are: 3 dummies for generation/immigrant status; years since migration (coded zero for non-immigrants); a dummy for ethnic origin reported as ‘very important’ (EOVI); 3 dummies for broad ethnic origin category; the log of the size of the city of residence; the log of the population of co-ethnics for 68 ethnic categories interacted with broad ethnic origin; and interactions of EOVI with an immigrant dummy, broad ethnic origin, and the log of the population of co-ethnics by broad ethnic origin.

Co-ethnic populations are defined only for people who have some ethnic origin other than ‘Canadian’, so the 414 observations who reported only ‘Canadian’ are dropped. Each regression is clustered on the level of aggregation for the co-ethnic populations, yielding 790 clusters in 1647 observations of employed males and 851 clusters in 1715 observations of employed females. Table 7 shows selected coefficients for these models, with standard errors and asymptotic p-values (due to the clustering). Detailed results are in the Appendix. The explanatory power of these models is

fairly low: R-squared is 0.075 for males and 0.088 for females. Logistic regressions yield essentially the same results. Regressions where EOVI is replaced with the 4-valued measure of the depth of ethnic identity yield results that are the same in spirit, but with somewhat higher variance.

There are three key features to note from Table 7. First, for both males and females, almost nothing is individually statistically significant. Second, for males, almost the only statistically significant effects are those discussed earlier. For males of European, but not British or French, origin the interaction effect between the depth of identity and the size of the co-ethnic population is large and statistically significant. The range of the middle 90% of the log of the co-ethnic population for the other European group is 5 to 11.5, so that this interaction term increases the probability of using a network by as much as 25 percentage points for those with deep identity depending on the co-ethnic population. However, the level effect of ethnic identity for 'other Europeans' is strongly negative, so that males with deep ethnic identity who live in cities with few co-ethnics are very unlikely to use an informal network to find a job.

Table 7: Finding a Job Through Family or Friends: Selected Coefficients

		Males			Females		
		Estimate	Std Err	P-value	Estimate	Std Err	P-value
Generation	One foreign-born parent	0.029	0.042	0.500	0.010	0.040	0.800
	Cdn-Born parents left out	0.014	0.048	0.780	-0.033	0.044	0.450
	Two foreign-born parents foreign-born	-0.004	0.055	0.950	0.126	0.073	0.090
Years Since Migration		0.001	0.001	0.380	-0.003	0.002	0.220
Ethnic Origin 'very important' (EOVI)		0.285	0.182	0.120	-0.112	0.153	0.460
Religion 'very important'		0.006	0.007	0.440	0.004	0.007	0.500
Broad Origin left out	Other European	0.012	0.156	0.940	-0.014	0.136	0.920
	British/French	0.223	0.221	0.310	-0.486	0.216	0.030
	Aboriginal	0.719	0.429	0.090	0.144	0.178	0.420
ln(city pop)		0.001	0.019	0.950	0.016	0.014	0.240
ln(coethnic pop)	British/French	0.014	0.021	0.510	-0.012	0.015	0.450
	Other European	0.013	0.020	0.520	-0.014	0.017	0.410
	Visible Minority	-0.009	0.015	0.570	0.017	0.019	0.360
	Aboriginal	-0.044	0.055	0.430	-0.056	0.021	0.010
interactions: EOVI*	foreign-born	-0.097	0.081	0.230	-0.072	0.070	0.310
	Other European	-0.636	0.262	0.020	0.244	0.296	0.410
	Visible Minority	-0.067	0.381	0.860	0.295	0.335	0.380
	Aboriginal	-0.890	0.663	0.180	-0.287	0.313	0.360
	ln(Br/Fr pop)	-0.020	0.017	0.230	0.013	0.014	0.360
	ln(Oth Eur pop)	0.042	0.020	0.040	-0.007	0.028	0.810
	ln(Vis Min pop)	0.000	0.029	0.990	-0.001	0.026	0.970
	ln(Abor pop)	0.042	0.076	0.580	0.067	0.029	0.020

Third, for females, foreign-born workers are much more likely, and visible minority workers much less likely, to use informal networks to find jobs. Fourth, the interaction effects of interest seem only to be important for Aboriginals. Aboriginal women who live in cities with many Aboriginal residents are less likely to use informal networks to find jobs, *unless* they express deep ethnic identity, in which case this co-ethnic population effect works in the other direction. Thus, the marginal effect of Aboriginal identity in combination with large Aboriginal population is to increase the use of job-finding networks.

Together, these results suggest that ethnic identity does influence how workers find jobs in ways that make sense. For majority (British/French origin) workers, neither the depth of ethnic identity nor the population of co-ethnics is associated with the probability of finding the current job through informal family/friends networks. This is consistent with an environment in which formal channels are ‘open’ to ethnic majority workers. Among males, other European origin workers use informal networks more if they *both* have deep ethnic identity and a large population of co-ethnics in their city of residence. This is consistent with ethnic identity tying one into an ethnically based network of job information and connections. The pattern is not seen for visible minority or for Aboriginal males, nor is it seen for European or visible minority women. However, we do observe the pattern for Aboriginal females.

5.3 The Importance of Ethnicity and Occupational Status

In Table 8, we show selected coefficient estimates from regressions using the Blishen occupational score as the left-hand side variable. In our data, the Blishen occupational prestige score ranges from 10 to 101. Professionals, such as engineers and lawyers score relatively high (60 to 75) while manual labour jobs tend to score lowest. This regression includes all the same right-hand side

variables as the regressions in Table 7 plus an interaction of this dummy indicating whether or not the job was found through family or friend and an interaction of this dummy with ethnic origin very important (EOVI).

Variable	Males			Females			
	Estimate	Std Err	P-value	Estimate	Std Err	P-value	
Generation	One foreign-born parent	-2.128	1.640	0.20	-0.089	1.152	0.94
<i>Cdn-Born parents</i>	Two foreign-born parents	-3.761	1.796	0.04	0.102	1.444	0.94
left out	foreign-born	-4.147	2.244	0.07	-4.080	2.539	0.11
Years Since Migration		0.093	0.085	0.28	0.148	0.080	0.06
Friend/Fam Job		-0.133	0.933	0.89	-1.214	1.072	0.26
Ethnic Origin 'very important' (EOVI)		2.296	6.509	0.72	1.601	4.735	0.74
Religion 'very important'		-0.023	0.295	0.94	-0.118	0.251	0.64
Broad Origin	Other European	-2.300	5.739	0.69	8.774	4.675	0.06
<i>British/French</i>	Visible Minority	1.902	7.308	0.80	-2.145	8.341	0.80
left out	Aboriginal	-22.925	7.931	0.00	-7.555	10.976	0.49
ln(city pop)		0.521	0.690	0.45	-0.008	0.558	0.99
ln(coethnic pop)	British/French	-0.781	0.737	0.29	0.400	0.608	0.51
	Other European	-0.515	0.725	0.48	-0.467	0.666	0.48
	Visible Minority	-1.197	0.548	0.03	0.435	0.663	0.51
	Aboriginal	0.762	0.976	0.44	1.527	1.451	0.29
interactions: EOVI*	Friend/Fam Job	-1.228	2.124	0.56	-0.420	1.942	0.83
	foreign-born	0.853	2.804	0.76	3.986	2.915	0.17
	Other European	-0.991	13.585	0.94	-5.431	10.033	0.59
	Visible Minority	-22.527	13.494	0.10	18.043	14.770	0.22
	Aboriginal	-14.300	13.859	0.30	44.755	12.399	0.00
	ln(Br/Fr pop)	-0.246	0.621	0.69	0.035	0.432	0.94
	ln(Oth Eur pop)	-0.275	1.189	0.82	0.588	0.934	0.53
	ln(Vis Min pop)	1.599	1.175	0.17	-1.956	1.307	0.14
	ln(Abor pop)	2.023	1.387	0.15	-5.077	1.372	0.00

Regressions are clustered by city and the 68-category ethnic origin variable as in the previous regressions, and detailed results are available in the Appendix. Because the Blishen score is available only in the 2000 data, we have 912 observations in 521 clusters for males and 1059 observations in 598 clusters for females. The explanatory power of these regression equations is reasonable: R-squared is equal to 0.33 for males, and equal to 0.32 for females.

Not surprisingly, for both males and females, foreign-born workers have occupations with lower Blishen scores. For males, this disadvantage extends to Canadian-born workers with two foreign-born parents. For men, Aboriginals fare much worse than other broad origin groups, which is consistent with other work on Aboriginals in Canada (see, especially, George and Kuhn 1994 and Pendakur and Pendakur 2002). However, visible minority men do not have occupations with lower Blishen scores, which is consistent with work on earnings disparities (e.g., Pendakur and Pendakur 1998) which shows that most disparity for visible minorities is within rather than across occupational categories. For women, differentials in occupational attainment are much smaller than for men, which is similar to what is seen in the earnings distribution, and women of 'other European' origin have higher occupational attainment than the other broad ethnic groups. For neither males nor females is the use of an informal network to find a job correlated with a higher or lower quality of the job actually found.

Considering now our variables of primary interest, deep ethnic identity affects occupational attainment only for particular population subgroups. Among men, visible minorities with deep ethnic identity have much lower occupational attainment than those without deep ethnic identity, and the size of the co-ethnic population does not affect this. Among women, Aboriginals with deep Aboriginal identity fare *better* in terms of occupational attainment than other Aboriginal women, and larger co-ethnic populations are correlated with worse occupational attainment.

The findings for men and women may not be consistent with a story where people with deep ethnic identity choose to work in an ethnic enclave resulting in lower occupational attainment but higher job satisfaction. Enclave work seems unlikely to be the driver of low occupational attainment because using a network to find a job is uncorrelated with the quality of the job found regardless of

the depth of ethnic identity.

The findings for men are consistent with models of social discrimination in which people do not discriminate on the basis of differentness of skin colour, but rather on the basis of differentness of behaviour (see, especially, Bloch and Rao 2004). In this context, visible minorities who do not have deep ethnic identity will ‘act white’ (‘assimilate’, ‘pass’), but visible minorities with deep ethnic identity will behave differently from the majority population, and thus face discrimination and disadvantage in the labour market.

The findings for women are harder to reconcile with a story of discrimination, and easier to reconcile with a model wherein large communities of Aboriginals are in fact detrimental to community members due to social interaction effects that induce poverty-traps (low attainment equilibria). Here, the poverty-trap is most important for those Aboriginal women with deep ethnic identity who live in cities with large Aboriginal communities, because deep identity is correlated with membership in the low-attainment community.

6. Conclusions

We use direct information on the depth of ethnic identity to explore the how identity correlates with two labour market processes often presumed to depend on it: the use of informal ethnic job networks, and the quality of jobs found. Our ethnic identity measure is based on a survey question which asks “is your ethnic origin very important to you, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important”, rather than on presumed correlates of identity often used in empirical work such as neighbourhood composition or ethnic origin.

The patterns that emerge are somewhat complex. Strong attachment to their ethnic identity does not affect the use of informal job finding networks for people of British and French origin (the

majority or plurality in most Canadian cities). This is consistent with an absence of ethnically defined job network for majority people. However, outside this majority ethnic origin grouping, we see different patterns. European-origin men of neither British nor French origin who say that their ethnic origin is important to them tend to use informal networks to find work, but only if their city has a large population of co-ethnics. We see a similar pattern for Aboriginal women. These patterns are consistent with ethnic identity offering entry to a social network of co-ethnics which comes with information about and access to jobs.

Ethnic identity also has some effect on the quality of jobs actually found. For males, we find that visible minority men with deep ethnic identity have jobs with lower occupational prestige than those without deep ethnic identity. This suggests that deep ethnic identity may be correlated with behaviours that make deeply identified visible minorities more 'different' from majority people than those visible minorities who do not have deep ethnic identity. This may be part of the price paid for the other benefits that come with deep identification with their ethnicity.

The story for men is easily summarized. We find evidence that ethnic job finding networks may be important for ethnically identified white minorities but not for ethnically identified visible minorities. However, we find that in general deep ethnic identity results in lower job quality for visible minorities and not for white minorities whether they use a network or not. For women ethnic identity seems only to matter amongst Aboriginal persons. Deeply identified Aboriginal women use informal networks more if they live in cities with many other Aboriginals. However, for these deeply identifying women, more Aboriginal persons living in the city, is correlated with lower occupational attainment.

7. References:

- Akerlof, G. and R. Kranton. 2000. "Economics and Identity". The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 115(3) pp. 715-753.
- Antecol, Heather and Deborah Cobb-Clark, 2004, "Identity and Racial Harrassment" IZA working paper No. 1149.
- Antecol, Heather and Kelly Bedard, 2004, "The Racial Wage Gap: The Importance of Labor Force Attachment Differences Across Black, Mexican, and White Men" Journal of Human Resources, 39(2), pp. 564-583.
- Appadurai, Arjun (1990) "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy" in Theory, Culture and Society SAGE, Vol 7. London: 295-310.
- Baker, M., and D. Benjamin, 1997, "Ethnicity, foreign birth and earnings: a Canada/US comparison", in Transition and Structural Change in the North American Labour Market, (eds.) M.G. Abbott, C.M. Beach, and R.P. Chaykowski. Kingston: IRC Press, Industrial Relations Centre, Queen's University.
- Battu, Harminder, Paul Seaman and Yves Zenou, 2004, "Job Contact Networks and Ethnic Minorities" Research Institute of Industrial Economics (IUI) Working Paper Series, No. 628.
- Battu, Harminder, McDonald Mwale and Yves Zenou, 2005, "Oppositional Identities and the Labor Market" Center for Economic Policy and Research Discussion Paper No. 3819.
- Bedolla, Lisa García, 2000, "They and We: Identity, Gender, and Politics among Latino Youth in Los Angeles" Social Science Quarterly March 2000 81(1), pp 106-123.
- Bedolla, Lisa García, 2003, "The Identity Paradox: Latino Language, Politics and Selective Dissociation", Latino Studies, July 2003, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 264-283(20).
- Bernard, Paul (1999) "La cohésion sociale: critique dialectique d'un quasi concept", Lien social et politique-RIAC: numéro 41, printemps 1999: 47-59.
- Blau, P. T.C. Blum; J.E. Schwarts. 1982. 'Heterogeneity and intermarriage', American Sociological Review 47(February) pp 45-62.
- Bloch, Francis and Vijayendra Rao, 2001, "Statistical Discrimination and Social Assimilation" Economics Bulletin 10(2), pp 1-5.
- Chandra, Amitabh. 2003. "Is the Convergence of the Racial Wage Gap Illusory?" National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper #9476.
- Fryer, Roland and Steven D. Levitt, 2003, "The Causes and Consequences of Distinctively Black Names" National Bureau of Economic Research working paper 9938.
- Granovetter, M. 2002. "A Theoretical Agenda for Economic Sociology". in Mauro Guillen, Randall Collins, Paula England and Marshall Meyer, (editors) The New Economic Sociology: Developments in an Emerging Field. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 35-59.
- Granovetter, M. 1995. Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hiebert, D. 1995. "The social geography of Toronto in 1931: a study of residential differentiation and social structure" Journal of Historical Geography 21: 55-74.
- Hall, Stuart (1992) "The Question of Cultural Identity" IN Stuart Hall, David Held and Tony McGrew, eds. Modernity and its Futures Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, UK: 274-316.
- Kuper, Adam (2000), Culture: The Anthropologists' Account Harvard University Press, Cambridge Massachusetts:177-184

- Pendakur, Krishna and Ravi Pendakur. 2002. "Colour My World: Has the Minority-Majority Earnings Gaps Changed Over Time?" Canadian Public Policy December 2002.
- Pendakur, Krishna and Ravi Pendakur. 1998. The Colour of Money: Earnings Differentials Across Ethnic Groups in Canada , Canadian Journal of Economics 31(3), pp 518-548.
- Portes, A. (1998) "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology" Annual Review of Sociology (24) 1-24
- Rothschild, J., 1981, Ethnopolitics: a conceptual Framework. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Simpson, G. and M. Yinger. 1965. 'Types of Majority-Minority Situations,' in Racial and Cultural Minorities: An Analysis of Prejudice and Discrimination 4th edition. New York: Harper Row.
- Swidler, Ann (1998) "Culture and social action" in Phillip Smith, ed. The New American Cultural Sociology Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK: 171-187
- UNESCO. 1969. Four Statements on the Race Question. Paris: UNESCO.

Appendix: Complete Regression Results

Table A1: Finding a Job Through Family or Friends (all parameters)							
Variable		Males			Females		
		Estimate	Std Err	P-value	Estimate	Std Err	P-value
Constant		0.045	0.184	0.81	0.931	0.194	0.00
Province	NF	0.025	0.099	0.80	0.143	0.082	0.08
<i>BC left out</i>	PEI	0.117	0.103	0.25	0.138	0.090	0.12
	NS	0.079	0.104	0.45	0.161	0.087	0.06
	NB	0.018	0.085	0.83	0.186	0.084	0.03
	PQ	0.042	0.076	0.58	0.166	0.070	0.02
	ON	0.111	0.086	0.20	0.164	0.073	0.02
	MN	0.089	0.083	0.29	0.077	0.070	0.27
	SK	0.074	0.088	0.40	0.122	0.069	0.08
	AB	0.115	0.082	0.16	0.112	0.068	0.10
Province*2002	BC	0.173	0.122	0.16	0.000	0.079	1.00
NF		-0.079	0.165	0.63	-0.103	0.125	0.41
	PEI	-0.112	0.159	0.48	-0.049	0.156	0.76
	NS	-0.127	0.166	0.45	-0.010	0.125	0.94
	NB	-0.074	0.133	0.58	-0.020	0.090	0.83
	PQ	-0.100	0.129	0.44	0.049	0.105	0.64
	ON	-0.265	0.139	0.06	-0.022	0.104	0.83
	MN	-0.241	0.147	0.10	0.012	0.106	0.91
	SK	-0.131	0.144	0.36	0.029	0.102	0.78
	AB	-0.178	0.139	0.20	0.039	0.096	0.68
Home Language	French (in PQ)	-0.071	0.056	0.20	-0.112	0.062	0.07
<i>English left out</i>	French (ROC)	-0.090	0.095	0.34	-0.028	0.071	0.69
	Other	0.007	0.047	0.87	0.056	0.056	0.32
Age	Age	-0.013	0.007	0.05	-0.013	0.007	0.06
	age squared	0.000	0.000	0.18	0.000	0.000	0.13
Education	some elementary	0.462	0.167	0.01	-0.614	0.143	0.00
<i>"no schooling"</i> left out	Completed elementary	0.460	0.150	0.00	-0.675	0.112	0.00
	some secondary	0.394	0.078	0.00	-0.464	0.085	0.00
	Completed secondary	0.418	0.068	0.00	-0.497	0.066	0.00
	some tech/comm college	0.336	0.078	0.00	-0.561	0.073	0.00
	Completed tech/comm college	0.308	0.069	0.00	-0.632	0.067	0.00
	some university	0.344	0.085	0.00	-0.605	0.075	0.00
	Bachelor's Degree	0.276	0.065	0.00	-0.696	0.065	0.00
	Master's Degree	0.170	0.076	0.03	-0.748	0.067	0.00
	Professional or PhD	0.172	0.078	0.03	-0.674	0.093	0.00
household size	2	-0.015	0.033	0.65	-0.010	0.030	0.72
<i>single left out</i>	3	-0.002	0.035	0.96	-0.004	0.032	0.90
	4	-0.028	0.035	0.42	0.037	0.033	0.26
	5	0.025	0.047	0.60	0.047	0.042	0.26

	6	-0.004	0.071	0.95	0.170	0.082	0.04
	7	-0.241	0.111	0.03	0.126	0.146	0.39
	8+	-0.211	0.127	0.10	-0.139	0.105	0.19
Generation	One foreign-born parent	0.029	0.042	0.50	0.010	0.040	0.80
<i>Cdn-Born parents</i>	Two foreign-born parents	0.014	0.048	0.78	-0.033	0.044	0.45
left out	foreign-born	-0.004	0.055	0.95	0.126	0.073	0.09
Years Since Migration		0.001	0.001	0.38	-0.003	0.002	0.22
Ethnic Origin 'very important' (EOVI)		0.285	0.182	0.12	-0.112	0.153	0.46
Religion 'very important'		0.006	0.007	0.44	0.004	0.007	0.50
Broad Origin	Other European	0.012	0.156	0.94	-0.014	0.136	0.92
<i>British/French</i>	Visible Minority	0.223	0.221	0.31	-0.486	0.216	0.03
left out	Aboriginal	0.719	0.429	0.09	0.144	0.178	0.42
ln(city pop)		0.001	0.019	0.95	0.016	0.014	0.24
ln(co-ethnic pop)	British/French	0.014	0.021	0.51	-0.012	0.015	0.45
	Other European	0.013	0.020	0.52	-0.014	0.017	0.41
	Visible Minority	-0.009	0.015	0.57	0.017	0.019	0.36
	Aboriginal	-0.044	0.055	0.43	-0.056	0.021	0.01
interactions: EOVI*	foreign-born	-0.097	0.081	0.23	-0.072	0.070	0.31
	Other European	-0.636	0.262	0.02	0.244	0.296	0.41
	Visible Minority	-0.067	0.381	0.86	0.295	0.335	0.38
	Aboriginal	-0.890	0.663	0.18	-0.287	0.313	0.36
	ln(Br/Fr pop)	-0.020	0.017	0.23	0.013	0.014	0.36
	ln(Oth Eur pop)	0.042	0.020	0.04	-0.007	0.028	0.81
	ln(Vis Min pop)	0.000	0.029	0.99	-0.001	0.026	0.97
	ln(Abor pop)	0.042	0.076	0.58	0.067	0.029	0.02

Variable		Males			Females		
		Estimate	Std Err	P-value	Estimate	Std Err	P-value
Constant		26.431	6.120	0.00	6.026	6.309	0.34
Province	NF	-0.109	2.939	0.97	-0.636	2.573	0.81
<i>BC</i> left out	PEI	0.448	3.159	0.89	0.239	2.536	0.93
	NS	3.643	3.668	0.32	1.059	2.689	0.69
	NB	-1.105	3.377	0.74	-0.451	2.871	0.88
	PQ	1.839	2.772	0.51	0.182	2.135	0.93
	ON	2.690	3.046	0.38	0.434	2.300	0.85
	MN	0.153	2.956	0.96	0.106	2.203	0.96
	SK	2.226	2.903	0.44	0.120	2.356	0.96
	AB	1.798	2.979	0.55	-1.173	2.259	0.60
Home Language	French (in PQ)	0.094	2.307	0.97	-0.528	2.196	0.81
<i>English</i> left out	French (ROC)	-0.888	2.886	0.76	-0.967	2.561	0.71
	Other	-2.031	1.489	0.17	-2.336	2.002	0.24
Age	age	0.631	0.229	0.01	0.844	0.215	0.00
	age squared	-0.007	0.003	0.03	-0.009	0.003	0.00

Education	some elementary	-11.835	4.193	0.01	(dropped)		
"no schooling"	completed elementary	5.153	4.747	0.28	3.366	4.909	0.49
left out	some secondary	-1.223	2.540	0.63	5.665	3.650	0.12
	completed secondary	0.892	2.289	0.70	11.415	3.606	0.00
	some tech/comm college	4.205	2.909	0.15	13.214	3.653	0.00
	completed tech/comm college	8.357	2.577	0.00	18.088	3.613	0.00
	some university	9.989	2.816	0.00	17.026	3.969	0.00
	Bachelor's Degree	14.624	2.388	0.00	24.989	3.653	0.00
	Master's Degree	23.976	2.806	0.00	30.403	3.886	0.00
	Professional or PhD	27.656	3.048	0.00	35.089	5.495	0.00
household size	2	2.308	1.257	0.07	0.241	1.179	0.84
single left out	3	2.617	1.300	0.05	1.194	1.284	0.35
	4	-0.344	1.304	0.79	-0.544	1.235	0.66
	5	1.200	1.635	0.46	0.741	1.561	0.64
	6	0.318	2.805	0.91	-5.718	3.342	0.09
	7	-1.036	2.183	0.64	0.487	4.700	0.92
	8+	6.727	7.224	0.35	-2.216	3.392	0.51
Generation	One foreign-born parent	-2.128	1.640	0.20	-0.089	1.152	0.94
<i>Cdn-Born</i>	Two foreign-born parents	-3.761	1.796	0.04	0.102	1.444	0.94
<i>parents</i>	foreign-born	-4.147	2.244	0.07	-4.080	2.539	0.11
left out							
Years Since Migration		0.093	0.085	0.28	0.148	0.080	0.06
Friend/Fam Job		-0.133	0.933	0.89	-1.214	1.072	0.26
Ethnic Origin 'very important' (EOVI)		2.296	6.509	0.72	1.601	4.735	0.74
Religion 'very important'		-0.023	0.295	0.94	-0.118	0.251	0.64
Broad Origin	Other European	-2.300	5.739	0.69	8.774	4.675	0.06
<i>British/French</i>	Visible Minority	1.902	7.308	0.80	-2.145	8.341	0.80
left out	Aboriginal	-22.925	7.931	0.00	-7.555	10.976	0.49
ln(city pop)		0.521	0.690	0.45	-0.008	0.558	0.99
ln(coethnic pop)	British/French	-0.781	0.737	0.29	0.400	0.608	0.51
	Other European	-0.515	0.725	0.48	-0.467	0.666	0.48
	Visible Minority	-1.197	0.548	0.03	0.435	0.663	0.51
	Aboriginal	0.762	0.976	0.44	1.527	1.451	0.29
interactions: EOVI*	Friend/Fam Job	-1.228	2.124	0.56	-0.420	1.942	0.83
	foreign-born	0.853	2.804	0.76	3.986	2.915	0.17
	Other European	-0.991	13.585	0.94	-5.431	10.033	0.59
	Visible Minority	-22.527	13.494	0.10	18.043	14.770	0.22
	Aboriginal	-14.300	13.859	0.30	44.755	12.399	0.00
	ln(Br/Fr pop)	-0.246	0.621	0.69	0.035	0.432	0.94
	ln(Oth Eur pop)	-0.275	1.189	0.82	0.588	0.934	0.53
	ln(Vis Min pop)	1.599	1.175	0.17	-1.956	1.307	0.14
	ln(Abor pop)	2.023	1.387	0.15	-5.077	1.372	0.00