

Community Well-being: A Comparable Communities Analysis

by
Jerry P. White
and
Paul S. Maxim

Strategic Research and Analysis Directorate
Indian and Northern Affairs Canada

February, 2007

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of
Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC).

Published under the authority of the
Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern
Development and Federal Interlocutor for
Métis and Non-Status Indians
Ottawa, 2007

www.ainc-inac.gc.ca

1-800-567-9604

TTY only 1-886-553-0554

QS-7085-000-EE-A1

Catalogue: R2-456/2007E-PDF

ISBN: 978-0-662-44811-2

© Minister of Public Works and Government
Services Canada

Cette publication peut aussi être obtenue

en français sous le titre : **Bien-être des collectivités : comparaisons entre collectivités
analogues**

Abstract

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) recently developed the Community Well-Being Index (CWB). This composite indicator combined census data on income, education, housing, and labour force activity to produce “well-being” scores for individual Canadian communities. INAC’s analyses of the CWB revealed a disparity in well-being between Indian reserves and other Canadian communities. This study examines the degree to which that disparity is a function of the small size and remote locations of many reserves, as opposed to the fact that they are reserves per se.

The Matching Communities 2001 (Maxim and White, 2001) analysis created by Paul Maxim and Jerry White from The University of Western Ontario provides a pair-wise comparison between reserves and matched non-reserve communities. The disparity between the reserve/non-reserve pairs was juxtaposed with that observed when all reserves and other communities are compared. Gross geography was also considered; disparities between reserves and their non-reserve matches were compared across four remoteness zones.

Overall, the disparity in well-being between the matched reserve/non-reserve pairs was very similar to the disparity between the complete set of reserves and other Canadian communities. This appears to suggest that no significant portion of the disparity between reserves and other communities can be attributed to either location or population size. Once gross geography was taken into account, however, we noticed that reserve communities nearer urban areas were more similar to their non-reserve matched community than reserves in more isolated parts of the country. With few notable exceptions, the disparities between reserves and their non-reserve community matches increased with geographic isolation.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Figures	iii
List of Tables	iii
1. Introduction	1
2. The Community Well-being Index (CWB)	2
3. Creating the Matching Communities	3
4. Analysing Disparities Between Reserves and Comparable Communities	5
5. Results	5
5.1 Reserve Versus Non-reserve Communities	5
5.2 Matched Communities	6
5.3 Stratifying by Geography	8
6. Conclusion	12
References	13

List of Figures

	Page
Figure 1 Matched Versus Unmatched Community Comparisons	7
Figure 2 CWB Differences by Zone	11
Figure 3 Income Differences by Zone	11
Figure 4 Education Differences by Zone	11
Figure 5 Housing Differences by Zone	11
Figure 6 Labour Differences by Zone	12

List of Tables

Table 1 Comparison of Non-reserve and Reserve Communities	6
Table 2 Comparison of Matched Reserve and Non-reserve Communities	7
Table 3 Comparison of Matched Non-reserve and Reserve Communities by Zone	10

1. Introduction

For the past several years, INAC's Strategic Research and Analysis Directorate has been researching well-being in First Nations communities. Among other things, the directorate has produced the Community Well-being Index (CWB). The index uses census data to assign a well-being score to all Canadian communities,¹ allowing the comparison of reserves² to other Canadian communities across time. Initial analyses of the CWB revealed that reserves had lower well-being than other Canadian communities in 2001 (McHardy and O'Sullivan, 2004), but that the gap had narrowed since 1991 (O'Sullivan and McHardy, 2004).

These findings, at first glance, suggest that there is something "about" reserves that inhibits well-being. This is not necessarily the case, however. The relationship between well-being and reserve status may be a spurious one. Reserves tend to have much smaller populations than non-reserves. The average reserve has approximately 500 persons. Larger communities are few and very rarely reach more than 5,000 persons. Reserves are also located disproportionately in remote or Northern areas where access to commodity, labour and consumer markets is limited. It may be these factors, and not characteristics intrinsic to reserves, behind the lower levels of well-being observed in reserve communities.

To assess this possibility, we paired a selection of reserves with non-reserve communities that are "comparable" on the basis of location and population size, effectively "controlling" for these factors. We then compared the disparity in well-being (CWB index) between reserves and all non-reserve communities to the disparity between reserves and their "comparable" non-reserve matches. A significantly smaller disparity between the matched communities would indicate that the lower levels of well-being observed in reserve communities were at least somewhat attributable to their location and population size. No disparity between the matched communities would indicate that being a reserve had absolutely no bearing on a community's well-being.

¹ Excluded from analyses were communities with fewer than 65 inhabitants, communities with data quality issues, and communities which did not participate in the census.

² INAC's list of reserves, which the designers of the CWB termed "First Nations communities", differed slightly from ours. They categorized both legal and non-legal reserves as First Nations communities, as this definition corresponds to that used by INAC and Statistics Canada to retrieve "on-reserve" figures from the Census of Canada. For reasons that will be expounded later, we chose to categorize non-legal reserves as "other Canadian communities or non-reserves".

2. The Community Well-being Index (CWB)

The CWB is a composite index which includes four facets of well-being. Based on an adaptation of the United Nations' Human Development Index (HDI) developed by Beavon and Cooke (2003) and elements of community-level analysis by Armstrong (2001), it utilizes indicators of education, labour force activity, income, and housing. These elements, which were derived from the Census of Canada, were combined to form a single "well-being score" for individual Canadian communities.³ These scores were used to compare the well-being of reserves and non reserves.

The CWB includes two indicators for education. The first, which is a proxy for literacy, is the proportion of the population, aged fifteen years and older, who have a grade nine or higher education. The second indicator "high school plus" measures the proportion of the population, aged 20 and older, who have achieved at least a high school education.⁴

Labour force activity is also comprised of two measures: labour force participation among those 20 years of age and over,⁵ and the employed proportion of the total labour force aged 15 and over.

The housing component of the CWB also includes two indicators. The first - housing quantity - is measured as the proportion of the population living in dwellings with no more than one person per room. The second - housing quality - is measured as the proportion of the population reporting that their dwellings did not need major repairs.

Income is defined as income per capita. Statistics Canada typically reports average income as total income over the total population, 15 years of age and over, who report having some income over this population. That is, people reporting zero incomes are excluded from the denominator. This approach effectively overestimates income for the Aboriginal population, given its lower average age and the higher proportion of Aboriginal people reporting no income. The designers of the CWB, therefore, opted to define the income component of the index as total income over total population, or income per capita.

³ Census subdivision (CSD) is the general term for municipalities (as determined by provincial legislation) or areas treated as municipal equivalents for statistical purposes (for example, Indian reserves, Indian settlements and unorganized territories). (Statistics Canada, 2003).

⁴ When these indicators are combined, 2/3 of the weight is given to the literacy proxy. This is the only element of the CWB in which unequal weights were applied.

⁵ Cooke (2005:5) points out that "... this variable is re-scaled, so that the upper limit is not the 1.0, or 100% labour force participation, an impossible and perhaps undesirable target. Rather, the authors (McHardy and O'Sullivan) set 0.8895, two standard deviations above the mean observed CSD labour force participation rate in 2001."

Cooke (2005) developed a conceptual critique of the CWB index. After assessing the key dimensions of well-being that are included in the CWB, the sources of data and their availability and comparability over time, the sensitivity of the indicators to change, and the weights and scaling assigned to the components in the index calculations, he concluded that the CWB compares favourably to other indices and “the CWB will to be a useful indicator of the well-being of any Aboriginal communities, and as other composite indices have done, it promises to make a positive contribution to Canadian policy research.” (Cooke, 2005:17).⁶

3. Creating the Matching Communities

Given that reserves have “special circumstances or conditions”, any comparison of their characteristics with those of other Canadian communities has reduced validity. The primary aim of this study is to examine the degree to which the lower levels of well-being in reserve communities are a function of the size and location of those communities. To do this, we selected a matched sample of non-reserve communities based on proximity and population size.

The list of matching communities was generated in a four-stage process. First, we measured the direct line distance between each reserve⁷ community and every non-reserve community in Canada. This distance was then standardized.⁸ Second, we recorded and standardized each community’s population size. Third, we used a mathematical algorithm to match each

⁶ Cooke reviewed the Quality of Life Indexes (QOL) (Hagerty et al., 2001), Prescott-Allen’s Indexes of the Well-Being of Nations (Prescott-Allen, 2001), Conference Board of Canada’s Quality of Life Scorecard (Conference Board of Canada, 2002), Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), Fordham Index of Social Health (ISH) (Brink and Zeesman, 1997), Fraser Institute Index of Living Standards (Emes and Hahn, 2001), Ontario Social Development Quality of Life Index (Shookner, 1998), and Index of Relative Indigenous Socioeconomic Disadvantage. (Gray and Auld, 2000).

⁷ As indicated earlier, the original CWB analysis conducted by McHardy and O’Sullivan categorized a selection of non-legal reserves as First Nations, or reserve communities. These communities are uniformly northern and can be of any type. INAC, interested in tracking the progress of communities with informal affiliations with First Nations bands or large Registered Indian populations, classifies non-legal reserves as such on a case-by-case basis. As McHardy and O’Sullivan were interested in how well-being in First Nations compares to that in other communities, their inclusive approach was appropriate. We, however, were interested in whether the causes for the disparity are inherent to First Nations or incidental. As such, it was necessary for us to adopt the stricter definition of reserve. With a few exceptions, legal reserves share the distinction of being governed by the *Indian Act* (INAC, 1985) (a piece of legislation with unique provisions and correspondingly unique effects) or specific self-government agreements. We should also note that the terminology used to refer to reserve communities varies in the literature, and that particular attention should always be paid to how reserves/First Nations/Aboriginal communities, etc. are defined in a given study.

⁸ All measures were converted to z-scores in order to provide for a common metric across all variables. One cannot reasonably compare measures based on kilometers or miles with size of population.

reserve with proximate non-reserves of similar population size.⁹ We chose the following algorithm, which is based on the mean absolute Euclidean distance across the variables for the two communities in question: where,

$$D = \frac{\sum w_j |z_j - z_j'|}{J}$$

- D is the “distance coefficient” between two communities;
 z_j is the standard score or z-value for the j^{th} variable of a First Nations CSD;
 z_j' is the standard score or z-value for the j^{th} variable of a *non* First Nations CSD;
 w_j is a weight attached to the j^{th} variable; and,
 J is the number of variables under consideration.

Finally, from the eight closest matches, we selected the best match based on direct examination. Using this method, we were able to create 495 reserve/non-reserve pairs.¹⁰

⁹ We should note that this method allows a non-reserve community to be selected as a match for more than one reserve community. Statistically, this is known as sampling with replacement and generally provides better parameter estimates (Maxim, 1999). In addition, we weighted the two variables, giving population more influence than geography.

¹⁰ It is important to emphasize again that our reserve/non-reserve typology is based on location and not exclusively population characteristics. Not all of the people living on a reserve are necessarily “Aboriginal”. Many non-Aboriginal spouses and children of band members or status Indians reside in reserve communities. Also, non-Aboriginal people are often employed on reserve. Some First Nations also rent or lease reserve land to non-Aboriginal persons. Consequently, it is possible that a reserve and its non-reserve match may have the same proportion of Aboriginal inhabitants. Indeed, the non-reserve match may have more. This geographically-based classification is appropriate given our interest in the effects on well-being of the special circumstances that exist on legal Indian reserves. Additional research that defines Aboriginal communities in terms of the size of their Aboriginal populations is warranted, but would address different issues than the ones under consideration here.

4. Analysing Disparities Between Reserves and Comparable Communities

First, we measured the disparity in CWB (and its four components) means between reserves¹¹ and all other Canadian communities. Second, we compared those disparities to those measured between reserves and the 495 similar non reserves with which they were paired. We also compared the differences in CWB means between reserves and their non-reserve pairs within four gross geographical categories: urban, rural, remote and special access. Details on each of these geographic zones, which are defined and assigned by INAC (2001),¹² are as follows:

Zone 1 (Urban): A geographic zone where the First Nation is located within 50 km of the nearest service centre with year-round road access.

Zone 2 (Rural): A geographic zone where the First Nation is located between 50 and 350 km from the nearest service centre with year-round road access.

Zone 3 (Remote): A geographic zone where the First Nation is located over 350 km from the nearest service centre with year-round road access.

Zone 4 (Special Access): A geographic zone where the First Nation has no year-round road access to a service centre and, as a result, experiences a higher cost of transportation.

5. Results

5.1 Reserve Versus Non-reserve Communities

In the “unmatched analyses” where all reserves were compared with all other Canadian communities, reserves scored lower on the CWB index and its components. Based on the data presented in Table 1, the average CWB score for the 495 reserves included in this study

¹¹ This comparison group was comprised of only the 495 reserves for which we were able to generate matches. Including the 46 additional reserves for which CWB data were available would have confounded our interpretation of the matched pairs. We would not have been able to eliminate the possibility that the absence of the unmatched reserves from the matched pairs analysis was the cause of any differences detected in well-being observed between the complete and paired samples.

¹² Where a First Nation band includes more than one reserve, that band is assigned to a remoteness category based on its most populous site. Consequently, remoteness classifications are not available for reserves not designated as a band’s more populous site. In total, remoteness classifications were available for 387 of the 495 (78%) reserves under consideration in this study. It must also be noted that remoteness classifications are not available for non-reserves. Since reserves are matched with non-reserves based, in part, on location, it is likely that most reserve/non-reserve pairs lie within the same remoteness zone. It is possible, however, that a non-reserve may occupy a different zone from the reserve with which it was matched.

was about 19% lower than the average score for other communities (.650 versus .806). For income, education, housing and labour force activity, the differences were approximately 31%, 9%, 23% and 12% respectively, all in favour of the non-reserve communities. These values provide a baseline against which the subsequent analyses can be compared.

Table 1
Comparison of Non-reserve and Reserve Communities

Variable	Non Reserve	Reserve	Difference	Standard Error of Difference
CWB Score	0.806	0.650	0.156	0.005
Income	0.727	0.499	0.228	0.006
Education	0.760	0.692	0.067	0.006
Housing	0.927	0.712	0.215	0.007
Labour Force Activity	0.808	0.696	0.112	0.004

Note: N=495 for reserve communities; N=4,181 for non-reserve communities. All differences are statistically significant at $p < .01$.

5.2 Matched Communities


Table 2 presents the results of the “matched pairs” analysis of the CWB index and its components. Overall, the disparities between reserves and their matched non-reserve communities differ little from those derived from the comparison of all reserves to all non-reserve communities. The results are presented graphically in Figure 1.

Table 2
Comparison of Matched Reserve and Non-reserve Communities

Variable	Non Reserve	Reserve	Difference	Standard Error of Difference
CWB Score	0.805	0.650	0.155	0.005
Income	0.721	0.499	0.222	0.007
Education	0.788	0.692	0.096	0.007
Housing	0.892	0.712	0.180	0.007
Labour Force Activity	0.820	0.696	0.124	0.006

Note: N=495 matches. All differences are statistically significant at $p < .01$.

Figure 1
Matched Versus Unmatched Community Comparisons



In Figure 1, the vertical lines represent the results of the matched analyses of the CWB and each of its four components (Table 2 data). Specifically, the lines define the 95% confidence intervals around the difference between the average scores for reserves and the average scores for their non-reserve matches. Each of the lines shares its vertical plane with an “x”. These x’s represent the results of the unmatched analysis drawn from Table 1. Where the x

falls above the vertical line, we may say that the gap between reserves and non reserves decreased significantly when we controlled for community location and population size. Where the dot falls below the vertical line, we may say that the gap increased significantly when we controlled for community location and population size.

Only the “unmatched” values for housing and education fell outside the confidence boundaries generated by their respective “matched” analyses. The “unmatched” disparity in housing conditions fell about two points (on the 100-point scale) above the upper boundary of the “matched” confidence interval. This suggests that on the housing sub index, there is a small tendency toward convergence in the quality of housing when communities are matched on the basis of location and size. Undoubtedly, part of this convergence is due to the greater homogeneity of housing stock in remote areas.

The “unmatched” disparity in education, on the other hand, fell about two points below the lower boundary of the “matched” confidence interval. Again, this is not too surprising since more remote Aboriginal communities often suffer a “talent drain” while smaller and more remote non-Aboriginal communities are often “talent magnets”. This latter situation is particularly the case for resource-based communities where the demand for highly trained engineers and technicians is great.

No statistically significant difference was observed between the matched and unmatched analyses of either the income or labour force activity sub indices, or for the overall CWB index.¹³

5.3 Stratifying by Geography

The previous analysis suggests that, even when population size and proximity are controlled, there is no systematic convergence in measured well-being between reserves and non-reserve communities.

Another question that might be asked, however, is whether there are variations in discrepancy between reserves and matched non-reserve communities when gross geography is considered. One might hypothesize, for example, that matched pairs in remote areas are more similar than those in less remote areas.

¹³ McHardy and O’Sullivan (2004) found that, although the overall disparity between reserves and non reserves was significant in 2001, well-being varied greatly among reserves. As an aside, we examined the differences in CWB scores between individual reserve/non-reserve pairs. In keeping with McHardy and O’Sullivan’s findings, we found a great deal of variation among pairs. The disparities between reserves and their non-reserve pairs (measured as non-reserve CWB score minus reserve CWB score) were normally distributed between about -.23 and .44. Still, the predominance of the non-reserve communities was clear: the non reserve had a higher score than its reserve match in about 93% of the cases.

We addressed this question by using the broad, four-category zonal differentiation described earlier. Our results for the CWB and each of its components, broken down by geographic zone, are presented in Table 3.

The first block in Table 3 presents the results for the CWB index. As previously demonstrated in McHardy and O'Sullivan (2004), reserves in and near urban areas had the highest scores, while reserves in the "Special Access" zone had the lowest scores. The scores calculated for reserves in Zones 2 and 3 fell between these two extremes. Our matched community analysis demonstrates that the relative well-being of reserves and their non-reserve matches were distributed in the same way: the disparity between reserves and their non-reserve matches increased with isolation. The fact that reserves in Zone 3 had higher scores than reserves in the less remote Zone 2 is somewhat counterintuitive. This anomaly notwithstanding¹⁴, however, these results indicate that isolation adversely impacts both reserves and non reserves, but that the effect on reserves is more pronounced. Figure 2 provides 95% confidence intervals for the differences between the two types of communities provided in Table 3. It demonstrates that the likely disparity in CWB scores between reserves and their non-reserve matches in Zone 1, for example, fell between about 0.11 and 0.14.

The remaining blocks in Table 3 display the distribution of income, education, housing and labour force participation respectively by geographical zone. Confidence intervals for those results are presented in Figure 3 through Figure 6. As might be expected with a large number of comparisons, some deviations from an overall pattern exist. Generally speaking, though, the results were similar to those calculated for the CWB index. Reserves in Zone 4 tended to have the lowest scores while reserves proximal to urban areas had the highest scores. Scores for reserves in Zones 2 and 3 generally fell between those calculated for reserves in zones 1 and 4. In most cases, the average score for the 11 reserves in Zone 3 were higher than that of the 200 reserves in Zone 2. The disparity between reserves and non reserves tends to follow the same pattern. The zones, ranked from smallest to largest in terms of the reserve/non-reserve disparities therein, are as follows: Zone 1 (Urban), Zone 3 (Remote), Zone 2 (Rural), and Zone 4 (Special Access). Again, the preponderance of reserves in Zone 3 over those in Zone 2 notwithstanding, isolation appears to have a negative effect on well-being in both type of communities, but to impact reserves more strongly.

¹⁴ We chose not to attach too much significance to this anomaly given that the distinction between Zones 2 and 3 is arbitrary, and that only 11 reserves were categorized as Zone 3 reserves. Further research is certainly indicated, however, as there are a number of interesting reasons why remote reserves might achieve higher levels of well-being than rural reserves. A popular explanation is that a road into a remote community indicates the nearby exploitation of natural resources. Such exploitation could spur economic development.

Table 3
Comparison of Matched Non-reserve and Reserve Communities by Zone

	Non Reserve	Reserve	Difference	Standard Error of Difference
CWB Score				
Zone 1 (Urban)	0.832	0.706	0.126	0.009
Zone 2 (Rural)	0.800	0.640	0.160	0.007
Zone 3 (Remote)	0.745	0.639	0.106	0.022
Zone 4 (Special Access)	0.782	0.583	0.200	0.015
Income				
Zone 1 (Urban)	0.742	0.550	0.192	0.012
Zone 2 (Rural)	0.716	0.468	0.247	0.009
Zone 3 (Remote)	0.660	0.549	0.111	0.034
Zone 4 (Special Access)	0.707	0.480	0.227	0.016
Education				
Zone 1 (Urban)	0.827	0.769	0.058	0.010
Zone 2 (Rural)	0.768	0.702	0.066	0.010
Zone 3 (Remote)	0.735	0.577	0.157	0.042
Zone 4 (Special Access)	0.770	0.537	0.233	0.018
Housing				
Zone 1 (Urban)	0.933	0.782	0.151	0.012
Zone 2 (Rural)	0.900	0.704	0.196	0.011
Zone 3 (Remote)	0.843	0.713	0.130	0.026
Zone 4 (Special Access)	0.821	0.626	0.196	0.027
Labour Force				
Zone 1 (Urban)	0.825	0.721	0.104	0.011
Zone 2 (Rural)	0.817	0.686	0.130	0.009
Zone 3 (Remote)	0.741	0.716	0.026	0.042
Zone 4 (Special Access)	0.831	0.687	0.144	0.015

Figure 2
CWB Differences by Zone




Figure 3
Income Differences by Zone




Figure 4
Education Differences by Zone




Figure 5
Housing Differences by Zone





Figure 6
Labour Differences by Zone



6. Conclusion

The impetus behind this analysis was to ascertain whether the negative relationship between reserve status and community well-being reported by McHardy and O’Sullivan (2004) was spurious. That is, were the lower levels of well-being found on-reserve attributable to the fact that more reserves are remotely situated and sparsely populated, rather than to the fact that they are reserves per se? Overall, our matched analyses, which controlled for differences in location and population size between reserves and non-reserves, produced similar results to analyses that did not control for these factors. Evidently, there is something about reserves, apart from their isolation and small size, that has inhibited their ability to achieve levels of well-being akin to those observed in other Canadian communities. The list of possible factors is virtually endless. Perhaps community well-being on reserves was adversely affected by the legal limitations on-reserve land transfer. Perhaps the cultural and social impacts of colonial rule were significant.

We did, however, identify an interaction effect between gross geography and reserve status. Specifically, it seems that the well-being of reserves, both in absolute terms and relative to non-reserves, decreases as isolation increases. Based on the overall CWB scale, as well as on its sub-components, it is evident that reserves near urban areas are more similar to non-reserve communities than those in difficult to access parts of the country. There are some inconsistencies in our findings, however, indicating a need for further research in this area. Of particular interest in this regard are those reserve communities in the “remote” zone (Zone 3) that often show far more similarity with their matched counterparts than do reserves in other parts of the country.

References

- Armstrong, Robin P., 2001. "The Geographical Patterns of Socio-economic Well-being of First Nations Communities in Canada" in Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series - Working Paper No. 46. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Beavon, D., and M. Cooke, 2003. "An Application of the United Nations Human Development Index to Registered Indians in Canada" in *Aboriginal Conditions*, ed. J. White, D. Beacon, and P. Maxim. Vancouver: UBA Press.
- Brink, S., and A. Zeeman, 1997. "Measuring Social Well-being: An Index of Social Health for Canada". Ottawa: HRDC Research Paper R-97-9E.
- Conference Board of Canada, 2002. "Performance and Potential, 2002-03 - Canada 2010: Challenges and Choices at Home and Abroad". Ottawa.
<http://www.conferenceboard.ca/documents.asp?next=427>
- Cooke, M., 2005. "The First Nations Community Well-Being Index (CWB): A Conceptual Review". Report for the Strategic Research and Analysis Directorate, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Ottawa: INAC.
http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/pr/ra/cwb_e.html
- Emes, Joel, and Ernie Hahn, 2001. "Measuring Development: An Index of Human Progress". Fraser Institute Occasional Paper Number 36. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.
- Gray, M.C., and A.J. Auld, 2000. "Towards an Index of Relative Indigenous Socioeconomic Disadvantage". Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research ANU, Canberra. Discussion Paper 196. http://www.anu.edu.au/caepr/Publications/DP/2000_DP196.pdf
- Hagerty, Michael R., Robert A. Cummins, Abbott L. Ferriss, Kennerth Land, Alex C. Michalos, Mark Peterson, Andrew Sharpe, Joseph Sirgy, and Joachim Vogel, 2001. "Quality of Life Indexes for National Policy". Review and Agenda for National Policy.
- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 2001. "Band Classification Manual", March 2001. Ottawa: Corporate Information Management Directorate, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Ottawa: INAC.
http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/pr/pub/fnnrg/2001/bandc_e.pdf
- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 1985 Annotated Indian Act, 1985.
http://www.canadahistory.com/sections/documents/1985_indian_act.htm
- Maxim, P., 1999. "Quantitative Research Methods in the Social Sciences". New York: Oxford University Press.

Maxim, Paul and Jerry White, 2001. "The Matching Communities, 2001". Report prepared for the Strategic Research and Analysis Directorate, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Ottawa: INAC.

McHardy, Mindy, and Erin O'Sullivan, 2004. "First Nations Community Well-Being in Canada: The Community Well-Being Index (CWB), 2001". Strategic Research and Analysis Directorate, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Ottawa: INAC.

http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/pr/ra/cwb/index_e.html

O'Sullivan, Erin, and Mindy McHardy, 2004. "The Community Well-Being (CWB) Index: Disparity in Well-Being Between First Nations and Other Canadian Communities Over Time", Catalogue No. R2-349/2004E, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Strategic Research and Analysis Division. Ottawa: INAC.

http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/pr/ra/dwb/index_e.html

Prescott-Allen, R., 2001. "The Wellbeing of Nations: A Country-by-Country Index of Quality of Life and the Environment". London: UNEP/Island Press.

Shookner, Malcolm, 1998. "A Quality of Life Index for Ontario". Paper presented at the Centre for the Study of Living Standards, conference on the State of Living Standards and the Quality of Life in Canada. Ottawa.

Statistics Canada, 2003. "Geographic Units: Census Subdivision (CSD)".

<http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census01/Products/Reference/dict/geo012.htm>