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One of the key assumptions in race and ethnic studies is the association between sharing neighborhoods with co-ethnic members and more co-ethnic interaction (Alba and Logan 1991; Farley and Frey 1994; Massey and Denton 1988; Park 1950). Since the early hypothesis of the Chicago School suggests that physical distance reflects social distance, sharing neighborhoods with co-ethnic members always implies more co-ethnic social interaction. This idea was further forcefully reinforced by Massey and his colleagues in their spatial assimilation perspective (Massey and Mullan 1984). They argued that as individuals move out of their co-ethnic neighborhoods, they have less contact with their own group and more contact with other groups (Charles 2003).

This association has considerable application to the studies of race and ethnic relations. Studies of ethnic businesses have suggested that residential proximity fosters social interaction, which leads to the development of co-ethnic social capital (Nee, Sanders and Sernau 1994). In the study of ethnic conflict, Olzark (OIzak, Shanahan and McEneaney 1996) noted that racial and ethnic residential segregation leads to more group conflict as co-ethnic members have more opportunities to interact and can more easily share their grievances. Immigration studies have suggested that when immigrants first arrive in a new country, they stay close to their co-ethnic members for easy access to social support (Iceland and Scopilliti 2008).

Given the importance of this assumption in understanding race and ethnic relations, it is surprising that few studies have systematically examined the relationship between sharing neighborhoods with co-ethnic members and more co-ethnic interaction.

The examination of the relationship not only is relevant to race and ethnic studies, but also fits into the larger debate about social interaction patterns in contemporary society. Since the 1970's, a major theme in the discussion of social interaction patterns in society has been the narrow scope personal connection. Robert Putnam's (2000) publication with the effective analogy of "bowling alone"
gave the topic considerable public attention. In recent decades, people have maintained small numbers of personal connections, and researchers also suggest that they maintain fewer contacts in the community.

In his recent publication, Fischer (2011) succinctly summarized the sources of this limited social interaction at the individual and community levels. He argued that a wide variety of communication technologies makes communication less spatial and more virtual, that delaying marriage implies delaying settling down in a community, and that current job requirements lead to more people working long hours. On the other side of the debate, studies have suggested that individuals still maintain close and meaningful contact with friends and relatives (Fischer 2011). Some studies comment on the resilience of community (Keller 2003). Some even suggest that a gated community in today cities reinforces interaction within the community (Durington 2006). Despite the many publications reflecting this heated discussion, most of the studies do not differentiate ethnic background or immigrant population. Therefore, we do not know the relationship between immigrants residing in co-ethnic neighborhoods and co-ethnic interaction of specific groups.

In this paper, we merged the 2008 General Social Survey with the 2006 Canadian census to explore the relationship between the co-ethnic composition of neighborhoods and co-ethnic interaction among immigrant groups. The analysis is based on two questions in the GSS: "In the past month, have you done a favour for a neighbor?" and "In the past month, have any of your neighbors done a favour for you?" We used the questions on giving and receiving favors because anthropologists have demonstrated repeatedly that reciprocity and "giving gifts" are important elements of maintaining social interaction. In our study, we focused on four major minority immigrant groups (Chinese, South Asian, black, and Filipino) and four European immigrant groups (Italian, Polish, Portuguese, and Ukrainian. The majority of the included European immigrant groups arrived in Canada between 1940 and 1960,
whereas the majority of the included minority immigrant groups arrived after 1970. The study included 48 major cities in Canada.

Our findings show that, controlling for socioeconomic and demographic background, the proportion of co-ethnic members in a neighborhood does not relate to the likelihood of giving or receiving favors. This pattern applies to the immigrant population, Canadian born population, and even to individuals who recently experienced major life events and may need considerable social support. The findings have significant implications for our understanding of the dynamics of sharing neighborhoods with co-ethnic members and co-ethnic interaction.

Table 1. means or proportions of variables

| Gave favours | 0.608 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Received favours | 0.558 |
| Proportion of own-group neighbours | 0.104 |
| Chinese (reference) | 0.172 |
| South Asian | 0.138 |
| Black | 0.114 |
| Filipinos | 0.056 |
| Polish | 0.139 |
| Ukrainian | 0.159 |
| Italians | 0.181 |
| Portuguese | 0.040 |
| Age | 44.5 |
| Women | 0.572 |
| Married (reference) | 0.561 |
| Widowed | 0.053 |
| Divorced or separated | 0.103 |
| Single | 0.283 |
| With a university degree (reference) | 0.336 |
| Some post secondary education | 0.394 |
| high school graduation only | 0.113 |
| Less than high school | 0.157 |
| Lowest income | 0.087 |
| low-middle income | 0.135 |
| Middle income | 0.163 |
| High-middle income | 0.201 |
| income missing | 0.209 |
| Highest income (reference) | 0.205 |
| Immigrant | 0.511 |
| In neighbourhood < 3 years (reference) | 0.233 |
| In neighbourhood 3 to 5 years | 0.128 |
| In neighbourhood over 5 years | 0.267 |
| Length of residence not stated | 0.372 |
| Toronto (reference) | 0.341 |
| Montreal | 0.102 |
| Vancouver | 0.133 |
| Other large metropolitan areas | 0.222 |
| Small metropolitan areas | 0.153 |
| Other cities | 0.049 |
| Proportion of immigrants in the neighbourhood | 0.332 |
| Sore 2a08 G |  |

[^0]Table 2. Linear probability models predicting giving or receiving favors from neighbors among selected $\underline{\text { minority groups in Canada }}$

|  | Giving favors |  |  | Receiving favors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
| Intercept | 0.610 *** | 0.571 *** | 0.534 *** | $0.566{ }^{* * *}$ | $0.624^{* * *}$ | 0.626 *** |
| Proportion of own-group neighbors | -0.202 *** | -0.026 | -0.067 | -0.159 ** | -0.021 | -0.019 |
| South Asian |  | 0.069 * | 0.069 * |  | 0.065 | 0.065 |
| Black |  | 0.095 * | 0.096 * |  | 0.102 * | 0.102 * |
| Filipinos |  | 0.048 | 0.043 |  | 0.027 | 0.027 |
| Polish |  | 0.104 * | 0.104 * |  | 0.119 * | 0.119 * |
| Ukrainian |  | 0.150 *** | 0.153 ** |  | 0.193 *** | 0.193 *** |
| Italians |  | $0.111^{* *}$ | 0.116 ** |  | 0.143 ** | 0.142 ** |
| Portuguese |  | 0.075 | 0.077 |  | 0.003 | 0.002 |
| Age |  | 0.001 | 0.001 |  | -0.001 | -0.001 |
| Women |  | -0.014 | -0.015 |  | 0.014 | 0.014 |
| Widowed |  | -0.147 * | -0.149 * |  | -0.117 | -0.117 |
| Divorced or separated |  | -0.087 * | -0.089 * |  | -0.133 ** | -0.133 ** |
| Single |  | -0.142 *** | -0.144*** |  | -0.144 *** | -0.144 *** |
| Some post secondary education |  | -0.008 | -0.008 |  | -0.033 | -0.033 |
| high school graduation only |  | -0.039 | -0.039 |  | -0.038 | -0.038 |
| Less than high school |  | -0.016 | -0.016 |  | 0.008 | 0.008 |
| Lowest income |  | 0.005 | 0.004 |  | 0.018 | 0.018 |
| low-middle income |  | -0.036 | -0.038 |  | -0.065 | -0.065 |
| Middle income |  | -0.048 | -0.049 |  | -0.055 | -0.055 |
| High-middle income |  | -0.019 | -0.019 |  | -0.060 * | -0.060 * |
| income missing |  | -0.060 * | -0.060 * |  | -0.050 | -0.050 |
| Immigrant |  | -0.035 | -0.038 |  | -0.022 | -0.021 |
| In neighborhood 3 to 5 years |  | 0.128 *** | 0.128 *** |  | 0.031 | 0.031 |
| In neighborhood over 5 years |  | 0.083 ** | 0.083 ** |  | 0.012 | 0.012 |
| Length of residence not stated |  | 0.093 *** | 0.093 *** |  | 0.024 | 0.024 |
| Montreal |  | -0.174 *** | -0.159 *** |  | -0.083 * | -0.084 * |
| Vancouver |  | -0.116 *** | -0.111 *** |  | -0.067 * | -0.067 * |
| Other large metropolitan areas |  | -0.057 * | -0.037 |  | -0.079 * | -0.080 * |
| Small metropolitan areas |  | -0.019 | 0.004 |  | -0.037 | -0.038 |
| Other cities |  | 0.013 | 0.040 |  | 0.005 | 0.004 |
| Proportion of immigrants |  |  | 0.098 |  |  | -0.005 |
| $N$ of observations | 2572 | 2572 | 2572 | 2572 | 2572 | 2572 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.004 | 0.061 | 0.061 | 0.002 | 0.038 | 0.038 |

Note: $\mathrm{p}^{* * *}<0.05, \mathrm{p}^{* *}<0.01, \mathrm{p}^{*}<0.1$
Source: 2008 General Social Survey and 2006 Canadian census

Table 3. Linear probability models predicting giving or receiving favors from neighbors among selected European minority groups in Canada

|  | Giving favors |  |  | Receiving favors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
| Intercept | $0.652^{* * *}$ | $0.679^{* * *}$ | $0.712^{* * *}$ | 0.609 *** | 0.681 *** | 0.776 *** |
| Proportion of own-group neighbors | $-0.044^{* *}$ | -0.019 | -0.006 | 0.002 | 0.049 | 0.087 |
| Age |  | 0.001 | 0.001 |  | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Women |  | -0.012 | -0.011 |  | 0.006 | 0.009 |
| Widowed |  | -0.057 | -0.056 |  | -0.080 | -0.076 |
| Divorced or separated |  | -0.073 | -0.071 |  | -0.098 | -0.092 |
| Single |  | -0.145 *** | $-0.143^{* * *}$ |  | $-0.150^{* * *}$ | -0.145 *** |
| Some post secondary education |  | -0.028 | -0.028 |  | -0.025 | -0.024 |
| high school graduation only |  | -0.120 ** | $-0.122^{* *}$ |  | -0.055 | -0.059 |
| Less than high school |  | 0.000 | 0.000 |  | 0.040 | 0.039 |
| Lowest income |  | -0.160 * | -0.160 * |  | -0.156 * | -0.155 * |
| low-middle income |  | 0.019 | 0.021 |  | -0.055 | -0.049 |
| Middle income |  | -0.009 | -0.008 |  | -0.059 | -0.057 |
| High-middle income |  | 0.025 | 0.025 |  | -0.035 | -0.034 |
| income missing |  | -0.038 | -0.037 |  | -0.059 | -0.057 |
| Immigrant |  | -0.104 ** | -0.099 ** |  | $-0.114^{* * *}$ | $-0.100^{* *}$ |
| In neighborhood 3 to 5 years |  | 0.083 | 0.083 |  | 0.060 | 0.063 |
| In neighborhood over 5 years |  | 0.049 | 0.050 |  | 0.023 | 0.026 |
| Length of residence not stated |  | 0.050 | 0.050 |  | 0.032 | 0.032 |
| Montreal |  | -0.138 ** | -0.154 ** |  | -0.015 | -0.063 |
| Vancouver |  | -0.065 | -0.071 |  | 0.010 | -0.007 |
| Other large metropolitan areas |  | -0.018 | -0.037 |  | -0.004 | -0.060 |
| Small metropolitan areas |  | 0.017 | -0.004 |  | 0.046 | -0.018 |
| Other cities |  | 0.101 | 0.076 |  | 0.111 * | 0.039 |
| Proportion of immigrants |  |  | -0.090 |  |  | -0.266 * |
| $N$ of observations | 1337 | 1337 | 1337 | 1337 | 1337 | 1337 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.000 | 0.052 | 0.051 | 0.000 | 0.028 | 0.031 |

Note: $\mathrm{p}^{* * *}<0.05, \mathrm{p}^{* *}<0.01, \mathrm{p}^{*}<0.1$
Source: 2008 General Social Survey and 2006 Canadian census

Table 4. Linear probability models predicting giving or receiving favors from neighbors among selected visible minority groups in Canada

|  | Giving favors |  |  | Receiving favors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
| Intercept | 0.548 *** | $0.628^{* * *}$ | $0.539^{* * *}$ | 0.503 *** | 0.693 *** | $0.627^{* * *}$ |
| Proportion of own-group neighbors | -0.095 | -0.100 | -0.211 * | -0.050 | -0.123 | -0.206 |
| Age |  | 0.000 | 0.000 |  | -0.001 | -0.001 |
| Women |  | -0.017 | -0.021 |  | 0.015 | 0.013 |
| Widowed |  | -0.189 * | -0.194 * |  | -0.114 | -0.118 |
| Divorced or separated |  | -0.085 | -0.091 |  | -0.147 * | -0.152 * |
| Single |  | -0.144 *** | $-0.148{ }^{* * *}$ |  | $-0.135^{* *}$ | -0.139 ** |
| Some post secondary education |  | 0.011 | 0.013 |  | -0.040 | -0.039 |
| high school graduation only |  | 0.032 | 0.032 |  | -0.034 | -0.034 |
| Less than high school |  | -0.009 | -0.010 |  | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| Lowest income |  | 0.086 | 0.083 |  | 0.116 | 0.114 |
| low-middle income |  | -0.086 | -0.094 |  | -0.075 | -0.080 |
| Middle income |  | -0.081 | -0.083 |  | -0.054 | -0.056 |
| High-middle income |  | -0.068 | -0.070 |  | -0.098 * | -0.100 * |
| income missing |  | -0.076 | -0.074 |  | -0.040 | -0.038 |
| Immigrant |  | 0.032 | 0.022 |  | 0.053 | 0.045 |
| In neighborhood 3 to 5 years |  | $0.154^{* * *}$ | $0.156^{* * *}$ |  | 0.015 | 0.016 |
| In neighborhood over 5 years |  | 0.108 ** | $0.110^{* *}$ |  | 0.014 | 0.016 |
| Length of residence not stated |  | $0.137^{* * *}$ | $0.133^{* * *}$ |  | 0.033 | 0.030 |
| Montreal |  | -0.193 *** | $-0.163^{* * *}$ |  | -0.121 * | -0.098 |
| Vancouver |  | -0.159 *** | -0.146 *** |  | -0.119 ** | -0.109 ** |
| Other large metropolitan areas |  | -0.105 * | -0.059 |  | -0.145 *** | -0.111 * |
| Small metropolitan areas |  | -0.056 | 0.004 |  | -0.133 * | -0.089 |
| Other cities |  | -0.235 | -0.162 |  | -0.224 | -0.170 |
| Proportion of immigrants |  |  | 0.234 |  |  | 0.175 |
| N of observations | 1235 | 1235 | 1235 | 1235 | 1235 | 1235 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.0004 | 0.054 | 0.057 | 0.000 | 0.028 | 0.029 |

Note: $\mathrm{p}^{* * *}<0.05, \mathrm{p}^{* *}<0.01, \mathrm{p}^{*}<0.1$
Source: 2008 General Social Survey and 2006 Canadian census

Table 5. Linear probability models predicting giving or receiving favors from neighbors among selected Canadian born ethnic groups in Canada

|  | Giving favors |  |  | Receiving favors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
| Intercept | $0.647^{* * *}$ | $0.687^{* * *}$ | 0.678 *** | $0.604^{* * *}$ | $0.742^{* * *}$ | 0.759 *** |
| Proportion of own-group neighbors | $-0.414^{* * *}$ | -0.253 * | -0.261 * | -0.342 ** | -0.180 | -0.164 |
| Age |  | 0.001 | 0.001 |  | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| Women |  | -0.023 | -0.024 |  | 0.005 | 0.005 |
| Widowed |  | -0.192 | -0.192 |  | -0.223 * | -0.222 * |
| Divorced or separated |  | -0.054 | -0.055 |  | -0.130 * | -0.129 * |
| Single |  | $-0.154^{* * *}$ | $-0.155^{* * *}$ |  | $-0.149^{* * *}$ | $-0.147^{* * *}$ |
| Some post secondary education |  | 0.044 | 0.044 |  | -0.034 | -0.035 |
| high school graduation only |  | -0.037 | -0.036 |  | -0.063 | -0.064 |
| Less than high school |  | 0.075 | 0.075 |  | 0.074 | 0.074 |
| Lowest income |  | -0.070 | -0.070 |  | 0.013 | 0.013 |
| low-middle income |  | -0.002 | -0.002 |  | -0.040 | -0.040 |
| Middle income |  | -0.087 | -0.087 * |  | -0.088 | -0.088 |
| High-middle income |  | 0.006 | 0.006 |  | -0.019 | -0.019 |
| income missing |  | -0.036 | -0.036 |  | -0.007 | -0.008 |
| Visible minority |  | $-0.111^{* *}$ | -0.112 ** |  | $-0.150^{* * *}$ | $-0.148^{* * *}$ |
| In neighborhood 3 to 5 years |  | 0.189 ** | 0.189 ** |  | 0.034 | 0.034 |
| In neighborhood over 5 years |  | 0.070 | 0.070 |  | 0.001 | 0.000 |
| Length of residence not stated |  | 0.070 | 0.071 |  | -0.016 | -0.017 |
| Montreal |  | -0.177 *** | $-0.173^{* * *}$ |  | -0.045 | -0.054 |
| Vancouver |  | -0.090 | -0.089 |  | -0.021 | -0.024 |
| Other large metropolitan areas |  | -0.087* | -0.082 |  | -0.071 | -0.081 |
| Small metropolitan areas |  | -0.042 | -0.036 |  | -0.041 | -0.053 |
| Other cities |  | 0.008 | 0.015 |  | 0.000 | -0.013 |
| Proportion of immigrants |  |  | 0.025 |  |  | -0.049 |
| N of observations | 1257 | 1257 | 1257 | 1257 | 1257 | 1257 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.0112 | 0.086 | 0.085 | 0.002 | 0.053 | 0.052 |

Note: $\mathrm{p}^{* * *}<0.05, \mathrm{p}^{* *}<0.01, \mathrm{p}^{*}<0.1$
Source: 2008 General Social Survey and 2006 Canadian census

Table 6. Linear probability models predicting giving or receiving favors from neighbors among selected immigrant born ethnic groups in Canada

|  | Giving favors |  |  | Receiving favors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
| Intercept | 0.568 *** | $0.622^{* * *}$ | $0.569^{* * *}$ | $0.521^{* * *}$ | $0.694^{* * *}$ | $0.693^{* * *}$ |
| Proportion of own-group neighbors | -0.059 | 0.006 | -0.051 | -0.020 | -0.007 | -0.008 |
| Age |  | 0.001 | 0.001 * |  | -0.001 | -0.001 |
| Women |  | -0.002 | -0.003 |  | 0.020 | 0.020 |
| Widowed |  | -0.124 | -0.129 |  | -0.065 | -0.065 |
| Divorced or separated |  | -0.101 | -0.104 |  | -0.123 * | -0.123 * |
| Single |  | -0.122 ** | -0.124 ** |  | -0.125 ** | $-0.125^{* *}$ |
| Some post secondary education |  | -0.037 | -0.036 |  | -0.013 | -0.013 |
| high school graduation only |  | -0.040 | -0.039 |  | -0.020 | -0.020 |
| Less than high school |  | -0.062 | -0.060 |  | -0.015 | -0.015 |
| Lowest income |  | 0.045 | 0.042 |  | 0.008 | 0.008 |
| low-middle income |  | -0.058 | -0.063 |  | -0.091 | -0.091 |
| Middle income |  | -0.028 | -0.030 |  | -0.057 | -0.057 |
| High-middle income |  | -0.047 | -0.049 |  | $-0.117^{* *}$ | -0.117 ** |
| income missing |  | -0.070 | -0.071 |  | -0.091 * | -0.091 * |
| Visible minority |  | -0.004 | -0.009 |  | 0.003 | 0.003 |
| In neighborhood 3 to 5 years |  | 0.079 | 0.079 |  | 0.017 | 0.017 |
| In neighborhood over 5 years |  | 0.094 * | 0.093 * |  | 0.014 | 0.014 |
| Length of residence not stated |  | 0.128 ** | $0.126^{* *}$ |  | 0.069 | 0.069 |
| Montreal |  | -0.162 ** | $-0.145^{* *}$ |  | -0.093 | -0.092 |
| Vancouver |  | -0.169 *** | $-0.164^{* * *}$ |  | -0.122 ** | -0.122 ** |
| Other large metropolitan areas |  | -0.044 | -0.018 |  | -0.094 * | -0.094 * |
| Small metropolitan areas |  | -0.016 | 0.018 |  | -0.027 | -0.026 |
| Other cities |  | -0.047 | -0.006 |  | 0.057 | 0.057 |
| Proportion of immigrants |  |  | 0.136 |  |  | 0.002 |
| N of observations | 1315 | 1315 | 1315 | 1315 | 1315 | 1315 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.000 | 0.039 | 0.039 | 0.000 | 0.017 | 0.157 |

[^1]Source: 2008 General Social Survey and 2006 Canadian census

Table 7. Linear probability models predicting giving or receiving favors from neighbors among major minority groups, individuals who recently experience life events

|  | Giving favors |  |  | Receiving favors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
| Intercept | $0.616^{* * *}$ | $0.575^{* * *}$ | $0.536^{* * *}$ | $0.576^{* * *}$ | $0.585^{* * *}$ | $0.571^{* * *}$ |
| Proportion of own-group neighbors | -0.152 | -0.008 | -0.051 | -0.148 | -0.040 | -0.055 |
| South Asian |  | 0.099 * | 0.098 * |  | 0.150 *** | $0.150^{* * *}$ |
| Black |  | $0.148^{* *}$ | $0.148^{* *}$ |  | $0.177^{* * *}$ | $0.177^{* * *}$ |
| Filipinos |  | 0.052 | 0.047 |  | 0.061 | 0.059 |
| Polish |  | $0.125^{* *}$ | 0.125 ** |  | $0.167^{* * *}$ | $0.167^{* * *}$ |
| Ukrainian |  | 0.148 ** | 0.151 ** |  | $0.214^{* * *}$ | $0.215^{* * *}$ |
| Italians |  | $0.147^{* *}$ | $0.152^{* * *}$ |  | $0.202^{* * *}$ | $0.203^{* * *}$ |
| Portuguese |  | 0.137 * | 0.140 * |  | 0.048 | 0.049 |
| Age |  | 0.002 | 0.002 |  | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| Women |  | -0.037 | -0.038 |  | -0.001 | -0.001 |
| Widowed |  | -0.171* | -0.174 * |  | -0.140 | -0.141 |
| Divorced or separated |  | -0.111* | -0.115 * |  | $-0.160^{* *}$ | -0.162 ** |
| Single |  | -0.155 *** | $-0.157^{* * *}$ |  | -0.159 *** | -0.159 *** |
| Some post secondary education |  | -0.008 | -0.008 |  | -0.021 | -0.021 |
| high school graduation only |  | -0.058 | -0.056 |  | -0.054 | -0.054 |
| Less than high school |  | 0.022 | 0.022 |  | 0.048 | 0.048 |
| Lowest income |  | 0.073 | 0.072 |  | 0.060 | 0.060 |
| low-middle income |  | -0.022 | -0.025 |  | -0.031 | -0.032 |
| Middle income |  | -0.019 | -0.021 |  | -0.039 | -0.040 |
| High-middle income |  | 0.008 | 0.007 |  | -0.030 | -0.030 |
| income missing |  | -0.037 | -0.037 |  | -0.016 | -0.016 |
| Immigrant |  | -0.064 * | -0.067 * |  | -0.050 | -0.051 |
| In neighborhood 3 to 5 years |  | 0.104 * | 0.104 * |  | -0.016 | -0.016 |
| In neighborhood over 5 years |  | 0.063 | 0.064 |  | -0.044 | -0.043 |
| Length of residence not stated |  | 0.070 * | 0.069 * |  | -0.023 | -0.024 |
| Montreal |  | $-0.225^{* * *}$ | $-0.209^{* * *}$ |  | -0.111 ** | -0.105 * |
| Vancouver |  | -0.140 *** | -0.136 *** |  | -0.055 | -0.054 |
| Other large metropolitan areas |  | -0.080 * | -0.058 |  | -0.100 ** | -0.093 * |
| Small metropolitan areas |  | -0.043 | -0.019 |  | -0.066 | -0.057 |
| Other cities |  | -0.051 | -0.023 |  | -0.030 | -0.020 |
| Proportion of immigrants |  |  | 0.104 |  |  | 0.036 |
| N of observations | 1722 | 1722 | 1722 | 1722 | 1722 | 1722 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.002 | 0.075 | 0.075 | 0.001 | 0.053 | 0.053 |

Note: $\mathrm{p}^{* * *}<0.05, \mathrm{p}^{* *}<0.01, \mathrm{p}^{*}<0.1$
Source: 2008 General Social Survey and 2006 Canadian census
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