## NCT-2 REPORT

## ETHNIC ORIGINS OF PARENTS AND GRANDPARENTS



NCT-2 Ethnic Origins of Parents and Grandparents Q. 15 and Ethnic Identity Q. 16

## Introduction

Given the high response of Canadian to both the NCT-1 ethnic questions (parents/grandparents and identity), a second test was conducted in September 1989. In NCT-2, open-ended questions replaced the mark-boxes featured in the NCT-1 version (see Appendix). This was done in response to the observed impact of mark-boxes on the distribution of certain ethnic groups. Given the recent advances in the development of automated coding of write-in responses such an option was feasible.

NCT-2 had two versions of the ethnic questions. One-half of the sample of respondents received a questionnaire which cited Canadian among the list of example ethnic groups. The other half of the sample received questionnaires not showing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups.

This report will address the following issues:

1. Level of non-response in an open-ended question format.
2. Response patterns of respondents who received the Canadian and non-Canadian questionnaires.
3. Examination of the population group which reported Canadian.
4. Listing of the advantages and disadvantages of various options for 1991 Census questions on ethnic origin and cultural identity.
1.1 Non-Response

The non-response rates in NCT-2 were 3 to 5 times greater compared with NCT-1. As well, the non-response rate was higher in the sample receiving questionnaires not citing Canadian in the list of examples. As indicated in Table 1, this trend was evident in the MT2 survey which also had a split sample focusing on the Canadian entry. In MT2, one-half of the sample had questionnaires in which Canadian was shown as a mark-in box.


The non-response in NCT-1 was under $5 \%$ for both the ethnic origin (Q.15) and ethnic identity (Q.16) questions. The non-response for $\mathrm{NCT}-2$ Q. 15 (parents/grandparents) was 14\% in the sample which listed the example Canadian and 16.5\% in the sample which did not list Canadian as an example ethnic group.

The non-response to the ethnic identity question was even higher. The sample receiving questionnaires not showing Canadian among the list of example ethnic groups had a non-response of $24.5 \%$ compared with $20.1 \%$ for the sample which did receive the Canadian questionnaires.

It is interesting to note that NCT-2 questions 15,16 and 17 experienced high levels of non-response: 14 to $24 \%$ range. It would appear that the response burden of these three questions was too high as respondents turned over the page in the NCT-2 questionnaire and answered the race and religion questions shown on the subsequent pages of the questionnaire. The non-response levels for the race (\#18) and religion (\#19) questions were just over 4\%.

It would appear the requirement to write-in up to four groups for each member of the household for both $Q .15$ and Q. 16 was too great a response burden for many respondents. The mark-box options lised in the 1986 Census and in NCT-1 may also have informed the respondents' answers.

There are specific patterns of response to $Q .15$ and Q. 16 that would only be observed when the questionnaires are inspected visually. In both questions, though to a greater degree in $Q .15$ than $Q .16$, respondents repeated within the question answer spaces the same ethnic group for each person.

For example, the respondent would give his origins as being English, English, French, French. Often the words father, mother, grandfather and grandmother would be placed beside the groups. Ditto marks were also used indicate that several of the respondent's ancestors belonged to the same ethnic group.

As shown in Table 2, respondents aged greater than 65 years were more likely to skip both $Q .15$ and $Q .16$ compared with younger respondents. For example, this age group made up $11 \%$ of the sample population but accounted for $16 \%$ of the non-response in the sample without Canadian and $20 \%$ of the non-response in the sample with the Canadian example in Q.15. These levels were about the same for Q.16, though a little lower -- 15\% (questionnaires not listing Canadian as an example) and 18\% (questionnaires listing Canadian as an example).

Table 2: Distribution of non-response by age group, Q. 15 and Q.16, NCT-2 Canada

| Age Group | Q15.(Parents/Grandparents) <br> Without <br> Canadian <br> $\%$ | With <br> Canadian <br> $\%$ | Q.16.(Identity) <br> Without <br> Canadian <br> $\%$ | With <br> Canadian <br> $\%$ | NCT-2 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Source: Statistics Canada unpublished NCT-2 weighted data

As indicated in Table 3, of those who received questionnaires not citing Canadian among the list of ethnic groups, respondents with a mother tongue of French (21\%), Ukrainian (26\%), or English and French (20\%) had the highest level of non-response to $Q .15$ (origins of parents and grandparents). These levels were higher compared with the overall non-response level of $17 \%$. As well, $44 \%$ of the respondents not answering the mother tongue question failed to report an ethnic origin.

Among those who received a questionnaire citing Canadian in the list of ethnic groups, respondents having a mother tongue of English (11\%), French (19\%), English and French (12\%) had higher non-response rates to Q. 15 . Overall the non-response rate for this question was $14 \%$. Of those who did not report a mother tongue, $49 \%$ did not answer the question on the ethnic origins of their parents and grandparents (Q.15).

Non-response was higher in the ethnic identity question (Q.16) compared with $Q .15$ (origins of parents and grandparents) and this is reflected in higher non-response levels for certain mother tongue groups. For example, in the sample receiving questionnaires not citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups, respondents with the mother tongue of Englïsh (24\%), French (28\%), Portuguese (39\%), Punjabi (18\%) and English and French (21\%) had the
Table 3: Non-respopnse(1) Q. 15 and Q. 16 by mother tongue, NCT-2 and NCT-1, Canada

| Mother Tongue | Q. 15 (Parents/Grandparents) |  | Q. 16 (Identity) |  | NCT-1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Without Canadian \% | With Canadian \% | Without Canadian \% | With Canadian \% | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Q. } 15 \\ \text { (Parents/ } \\ \text { Grandparents) } \\ \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Q. } 16 \\ \text { (Identity) } \\ \% \end{array}$ |
| English | 15 | 11 | 24 | 17 | 5 | 5 |
| French | 21 | 19 | 28 | 23 | 3 | 3 |
| Italian | 12 | 3 | 11 | 25 | 2 | 2 |
| Chinese | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| Ukrainián | 26 (2) | 7 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 5 |
| German | 5 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| Portuguese | - | - | 39 | 20 | 1 | 6 |
| Dutch | 2 | 6 | 4 | 14 | 7 | 8 |
| Greek | 4 | - | 4 | - | 3 | 3 |
| Spanish | 5 | - | 5 | - | 8 | 10 |
| Polish | 6 | 4 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 5 |
| Punjabi | 3 | - | 18 | - | 19 | 21 |
| Other | 9 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 10 |
| English \& French | 20 | 12 | 21 | 67 | 3 | 2 |
| English \& Other | - | - | 7 | 6 | 9 | 6 |
| French \& Other | - | - | - | - | 3 | 11 |
| English, French, Other | - | 100 (3) | - | 100 (3) | - | - |
| Non-response | 44 | 49 | 53 | 60 | 38 | 37 |
| Total non-response | 17 | 14 | 25 | 20 | 5 | 5 |

3. Total non-response: 5,084 weighted cases.
Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished, NCT-2 weighted data


#### Abstract

highest levels of non-response. Of those who did not' answer the mother tongue question, $53 \%$ did not answer the ethnic identity question. Overall, the level of non-response to $Q .16$ (ethnic identity) was $25 \%$.


In the sample which received questionnaires citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups, respondents reporting mother tongues of French (23\%), Italian (25\%), Portuguese (20\%), Dutch (14\%) or English and French (67\%) had the highest level of non-response to the question on ethnic identity. Of those who did not answer the mother tongue question, $60 \%$ did not answer the ethinic identity question. These levels are higher compared with the overall non-response to this question of $20 \%$.

Non-response was greater for persons \# 3, 4, and 5 in the household. This was particularly the case for the sample not showing in the list of example ethnic groups. Table 4 shows the increase in non-response experienced by the above mentioned persons in the household.

Non-response by province shows that apart from quebec and Saskatchewan, non-response was greater for the sample receiving questionnaires not citing Canadian as an example ethnic group. As indicated in Table 5, non-response was also uncharacteristically high in the Atlantic provinces.

Table 4: Distribution of non-response by person number

| Person \# | Q. 15 (Parents/Grandparents) |  | Q. 16 (Ethnic identity) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Without Canadian \% | With <br> Canadian \% | Without Canadian \% | With <br> Canadian \% |
| 1 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 17 |
| 2 | 14 | 13 | 16 | 15 |
| 3 | 20 | 14 | 20 | 17 |
| 4 | 19 | 12 | 21 | 17 |
| 5 | 20 | 14 | 22 | 19 |
| 6 | 20 | 24 | 25 | 26 |
| T. | 16 | 14 | 18 | 16 |

Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished NCT-2 weighted data
ble 5: Non-response by Province, NCT-2, Canada

| Province | Q. 15 (Parents/Grandparents) |  | Q. 16 (Ethnic Identity) |  | Total NCT-2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Without Canadian | With <br> Canadian | Without Canadian | With <br> Canadian |  |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Newfoundland | 13. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 2 |
| Prince Edward Island | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Nova Scotia | 7 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 3 |
| New Brunswick | 10 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 3 |
| Quebec | 20 | 21 | 15 | 18 | 26 |
| Ontario | 15 | 12 | 17 | 16 | 37 |
| Manitoba | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 4 |
| Saskatchewan | 9 | 14 | 9 | 12 | 4 |
| Alberta | 9 | 8 | 14 | 9 | 9 |
| Brilish Columbia | 8 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 12 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished NCT-2 weighted data

1. Non-response was unacceptably high to the open-ended questions. No doubt this level of non-response could be improved by mandatory follow-up, though cost factors could outweigh any benefits that might obtained from using an open-ended question.
2. Non-response rates to the questions not citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups were higher compared with the level of non-response reported by the sample receiving questionnaires listing Canadian as an example ethnic group.
3. The ethnic identity question (Q.16) had a higher non-response (20-24\%) compared with the origins of parents and grandparents question (Q.15).
4. Of those who did answer the ethnic and ethnic identity questions, there was a tendency to repeat groups more than one once in the spaces provided for each person in the household. This shows that many respondents made a very literal interpretation of the question. This pattern of response would lead to increased key-entry costs. Pre-entry grooming would be required to reduce the key-entry costis.
5. The elderly had a higher non-response level compared with the younger age groups. The English and French mother tongue groups had the highest non-response in Q. 15 and Q. 16 regardless of questionnaire type. Non-response among the nonofficial language groups was higher for Q. 16 compared with Q.15; especially Portuguese, Italian and Punjabi mother tongue groups.
6. Non-response increased in multi-person households as Persons \#3,4,5 and 6 had much higher levels on non-response compared with Persons \#1 and 2.
7. Residents of Quebec and Saskatchewan had a higher level of non-response in Q. 15 compared with Q.16. This pattern was the opposite that which was experienced elsewhere in the country.

As shown in Table $6,38 \%$ of the responses to the NCT-1 Q. 15 (origins of parents and grandparents) were Canadian (17\% single, $21 \%$ multiple). A much higher level of Canadian occurred in the ethnic identity question: $56 \%$ (37\% single, 18\% multiple).

As this high level of Canadian response altered the distribution of the other ethnic groups, the open-ended format was used in NCT-2. This was done to remove bias caused by the presence or absence of mark-boxes. One-half of the population received questionnaires citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups. The other half received questionnaires which did not list Canadian as an example ethnic group.
2.1

NCT-2 Level of Canadian

Overall, the level of Canadian was lower in NCT-2 open-ended questions compared with NCT-1 where Canadian was shown as a mark-box. Table 6 indicates the Canadian count was about 3 times higher in the sample which received the questionnaire citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups.
Table 6: Proportion of Total Canadian Responses by Survey Type, Canada.

| \% Responses Being Canadian |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Survey Type | Ethnic Origin | Origins ol Parents/ Grandparents 0.15 | Ethnic Identity Q. 16 |
|  | \% | \% | \% |
| - Censua |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 0.6 |  |  |
| 1986 | 0.5 |  |  |
| MT2 |  |  |  |
| With Canedian |  | 29.6 | 48.7 |
| Without Canadian |  | 0.7 | 2.2 |
| - $\mathrm{NCT}-1$ |  | 37.8 | 55.6 |
| NCT -2 |  |  |  |
| With Canadian |  | 25 | 34 |
| Without Canadian |  | 7.0 | 11.0 |

[^0]Table 6a: Comparsion of distribution of ethnic groups, unadjusted and adjusted for non-response, Q.15, Canada, NCT-2

|  | Unadjusted Q.15 |  | Adjusted for non-response Q.15 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

In Q. 15 (origins of parents and grandparents), $7 \%$ of the responses, on the questionnaire not showing the example of Canadian, reported the origin Canadian. Of these, 4\% were single response and $3 \%$ were multiple response. In the sample receiving questionnaires citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups, one-quarter of the respondents reported Canadian. Of these, $13 \%$ were single response Canadian and 12\% were multiple response Canadian.

The level of Canadian was highest in the ethnic identity question (Q.16). About $11 \%$ of the respondents answering the questionnaire which did not cite Canadian as an example ethnic group reported the group Canadian. Of these, $8 \%$ were single response Canadian and $3 \%$ were multiple response Canadian.

The sample receiving the questionnaire citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups reported a higher level of Canadian: $34 \%$. Of these, $28 \%$ were single response and $6 \%$ were multiple response Canadian.

There appears to be a strong tendency to mark Canadian when it is given as an example on the questionnaire. However, even without citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups in an open-ended question format,
about $7 \%$ of respondents reported Canadian as being the origin of their parents and grandparents and $11 \%$ responded Canadian as being their ethnic identity.

There was another difference in the $N C T-2$ open-ended situation: reduction in the size of the Canadian multiple response group. In $\mathrm{NCT}-1,21 \%$ of $Q .15$ and $18 \%$ of $Q .16$ responses were multiple response Canadian. This was reduced in the 2.15 open-ended situation to $3 \%$ (sample not citing Canadian) and $11 \%$ (sample citing Canadian). In NCT-2 Q.16, the multiple response Canadian was $3 \%$ (sample not citing Canadian) and 6\% (sample citing Canadian).

### 2.2 Characteristics of the Population Responding Canadian Location and Language

The NCT-2 population reporting Canadian tended to be more English and less likely to live in Quebec compared with the NCT-1 population who responded Canadian. However, when Quebecers and francophones were given a questionnaire with canadian listed as an example ethnic group, a greater proportion reported Canadian. This pattern was evident for both the NCT-2 ethnic origins of parents and grandparents and ethnic identity questions.

As shown in Tables 7 a and 8 a , over $53 \%$ of the NCT-1 Q. 15 Canadian respondents lived in Quebec and $53 \%$ reported a French mother tongue. In NCT-2, as indicated in Table 7, 37\% were from Quebec and another $42 \%$ lived in Ontario. About $26 \%$ of the total NCT-2 population lived in Quebec, thus Quebecers continued to disproportionately report Canadian though not as strongly as was shown in NCT-1. In NCT-2, residents from Ontario also disproportionately reported Canadian ( $42 \%$ ) as being the origin of their parents and grandparents, as $37 \%$ of the total population lived there.

The level of Quebec respondents reporting Canadian increased when respondents were given the questionnaire with Canadian listed as an example ethnic group. In Q. 15 (questionnaire citing Canadian in the examples), $42 \%$ of the Canadian response came from Quebec and $30 \%$ from Ontario. It is interesting to note that the Canadian response was also higher in New Brunswick. About $4 \%$ of the reported Canadian response came from this province, even though just 3\% of the NCT-2 population was located there.

Given the high level of Canadian response from Quebec, it is not surprising that it was francophones who responded Canadian as being the ethnic origin of their parents and 12

Table 7A: Single response Canadian by Province, NCT-1, Canada

| Province | ! |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q. 15 (Origins Parents/ Grandparents) | Q. 16 (Ethnic Identity) | Total |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Canadian | Canadian |  |
|  | \% | \% | \% |
| ewioundland | 3 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Prince Edward Island | - | - | - |
| Nova Scotia | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| New Brunswick | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Quebec | 53 | 29 | 26 |
| Ontario | 25 | 35 | 37 |
| Manitoba | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Saskatchewan | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Alberta | 4 | 10 | 9 |
| British Columbia | 6 | 11 | 12 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[^1]ole 8A: Canadian single response by mother tongue, Canada, NCT-1

|  | Q.15 (Origins <br> Parents/ <br> Grandparents) <br> Canadian <br> $\%$ | Q.16 (Ethnic Identity) |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |$\quad$| Total |
| :---: |
| NCT-1 |

Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished NCT-2 weighted data

Table 7: Single Flesponse Canadian by Province, NCT-2.

| Province | Q. 15 Ethnic Origin Parents/Grandparents without with Canadian Canadian |  | 0.16 Ethnic Identity <br> without with Canadian Canadian |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | 96 | 9 | \% | 96 |
| Newfoundland | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Prince Edward Island | - | - | - | - | - |
| Nova Scotia | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Now Brunswick | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Quebec | 37 | 42 | 10 | 25 | 26 |
| Ontario | 42 | 30 | 53 | 39 | 37 |
| Manitoba | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Saskatchewan | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| Alberta | 8 | 7 | 11 | 9 | 9 |
| British Columbia | 6 | 6 | 14 | 12 | 12 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Stalistics Canada, unpublished NCT-2 data
Weighted data
Due to rounding totals may not equal $100 \%$ in all cases.
grandparents. This pattern was observed in NCT-1 as indicated in Table 8a. However, the proportion of mother tongue French respondents reporting Canadian to Q. 15 was not as high in NCT-2 compared with NCT-1.

In NCT-1, $53 \%$ of respondents who reported Canadian to Q. 15 had a mother tongue of French. In NCT-2 as shown in Table 8 , just under $37 \%$ of respondents who reported Canadian as being the ethnic origin of their parents and grandparents had a French mother tongue (non-Canadian sample). This level increased when respondents received questionnaires listing the example Canadian as $42 \%$ of the Canadian response was given by those also reporting a French mother tongue.

The Canadian responses to the NCT-2 ethnic identity question followed the pattern observed in NCT-1. Respondents were more likely to live outside of Quebec and to report English as their mother tongue. In NCT-1, 67\% of the population reporting Canadian as their ethnic identity population had an English mother tongue. The NCT-2 results also showed an even stronger English mother tongue response among those reporting a Canadian ethnic identity.

As shown in Table 7 , of the respondents giving Canadian as their ethnic identity in NCT-2 (Canadian not cited in the list of example ethnic groups), $53 \%$ were from ontario and just 10\% lived in Quebec. This group (Table 8) was largely anglophone: 83\% had an English mother tongue and 12\% reported French.

Of those reporting a Canadian ethnic identity, the level of French mother tongue and Quebec response increased in the sample receiving questionnaires citing Canadian as an example ethnic group. Of this sample, $25 \%$ were from Quebec and 39\% lived in ontario. Overall, other than Ontario being marginally over represented, no one province overwhelming reported Canadian as an ethnic identity when in recipient of questionnaires citing canadian in the list of example ethnic groups.

Of those reporting a Canadian ethnic identity (Q. 16 sample receiving questionnaires citing Canadian as an example ethnic group), 72\% reported an English mother tongue, $23 \%$ French and $3 \%$ said they had a mother tongue other than English or French.

Table 8: Canadian Single Respone by Mother Tongue. Canada, NCT-2.

| Mother Tongue$0.10$ | Q.15 Ethnic Origin <br> Parents/Grandparents |  | 0.16 Ethnic Identity |  | Total Mother Tongue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | without <br> Canadian | with Canadian | without Canadian | with Canadian |  |
|  | $\%$ | $\%$ | \% | \% | \% |
| English | 58 | 53 | 83 | 72 | 59 |
| Frsnch | 37 | 42 | 12 | 23 | 26 |
| Other | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 12 |
| Non Response | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Statistics Canada, unpublishsd NCT-2 data
Rounded, weignted data

Table 9: Canadian Respones by Age. Canada, NCT-2.

| Age Group | Q. 15 Ethnic Origin <br> Parenta/Grandparents <br> without with <br> Canadian Canadian |  | 0.16 Ethni <br> without <br> Canadian | identity <br> with <br> Canadian | Total Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Canadian |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0-24 yeart | 60 | 51 | 47 | 42 | 38 |
| 25-64 years | 38 | 42 | 48 | 51 | 53 |
| 65 years and over | 2 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 11 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished NCT-2 data.
Rounded, weighted data.

Age

While the population group under age 25 comprised $36 \%$ of the NCT-2 sample, in $Q .15$ (origins of parents and grandparents) this age group accounted for $60 \%$ of the reported Canadian response given by those who received the questionnaire not citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups (Table 9). Regarding the sample receiving questionnaires citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups, $51 \%$ of the NCT-2 single response Canadian was reported by those under age 25. Overall, the NCT-2 Canadian ethnic origin response (Q.15) was somewhat more youthful compared with the NCT-1 results where $48 \%$ of the Canadian response was reported by respondents under age 25 (Table 9a).

In response to the $\mathrm{NCT}-2$ question on ethnic identity, youth were again more likely to report Canadian when given a questionnaire not showing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups. of this sample, youth comprised $47 \%$ of the reported Canadian ethnic identity response. Of those receiving questionnaires citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups, the group under age 25 reported $42 \%$ of the Canadian response. This compares with the NCT-1 figures shown in Table 9a, where 43\% of the Canadian ethnic identity response was reported by respondents under age 25. 15

| Age Group | Q. 15 <br> Drigins of Parents and Grandparents Canadian | 0.16 <br> Ethnic <br> Indentity <br> Canadian | Total Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% |
| $0-24$ years | 48 | 43 | 36 |
| 25-64 years | 47 | 51 | 53 |
| 65 years and over | 5 | 6 | 11 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished NCT-1 data.

Given that youth were more likely to report Canadian compared with older respondents, it comes as no surprise that the Canadian response was given disproportionately by Persons \#3 and \#4 in the household. (Due to the small sample size of NCT-2, data for persons \# 5 and \#6 are likely to be unreliable.) This pattern remained consistent regardless of the questionnaire type for both Q. 15 and $Q .16$ (Table 10).

Also noticeable in the distribution of Canadian by person number was the increasing trend for persons \#1 and \#2 to report Canadian to the questions on ethnic origin and ethnic identity when Canadian was cited as an example in the list of example ethnic groups.

Immigrant status

As was the case in NCT-1 (Table lla), the NCT-2 population reporting Canadian as ethnic origin or as ethnic identity tended to be non-immigrant. Of the total NCT-2 population, immigrants comprised 13\%. As shown in Table 11, no immigrants gave a single response of Canadian to the question on the ethnic origins of their parents and 16

Table 10: Singla Response Canadian by Person \#, Q. 15 and Q.16, NCT-2, Canada.

| Person ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | Q. 15 Ethnic Origin <br> Parente/Grandparente <br> without with <br> Canadian Canadian |  | 0. 16 Ethnic Identity <br> without with <br> Canadian Canadian |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | * | \% | 4 | * | 4 |
| 1 | 25 | 28 | 31 | 32 | 37 |
| 2 | 21 | 26 | 24 | 30 | 29 |
| 3 | 34 | 26 | 28 | 21 | 18 |
| 4 | 18 | 16 | 18 | 13 | 11 |
| 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 6 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished NCT-2 data.
Rounded, weighted data.
-Velues too low to be statistically reliable.

Table 11A: Single response Canadian by immigrant status, Canada, NCT-1

| Immigrant Status | Q. 15 (Origins <br> Parents/ <br> Grandparents) | Q. 16 (Ethnic Identity) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { NCT-1 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Canadian \% | Canadian \% | \% |
| Immigrant | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| Non-immigrant | 99 | 96 | 81 |
| Non-response | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[^2]Table 11: Single Response Canadian by Immigrant Status, Canada, NCT-2.

| Immigrant Statue | Canadian |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q. 15 Ethnic OriginParents/Grandparents $\quad$ Q. 16 Ethnic Identity |  |  |  | Total Immigrant Status |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Immigrant | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 13 |
| Non-immigrant | 96 | 97 | 95 | 96 | 81 |
| Non-response | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Canada. unpublished data.
Rounded, weighted data.
grandparents (NCT-2). In response to the ethnic identity question $2-3 \%$ of respondents reporting Canadian were immigrant.

> 2.4: Transfer of response from the ethnic origin question to the ethnic identity question

As shown in Table 12 , the response of Canadian in NCT-2 Q. 15 (parents and grandparents) reported by the sample receiving questionnaires not citing Canadian in the list of ethnic groups was unstable in its transfer of response in Q. 16 -- ethnic identity. For example, of the respondents who answered Canadian in Q.15, nearly one-quarter did not answer Q. 16 and a further $63 \%$ reported their ethnic identity as being Canadian. Another $6 \%$ of the Canadian ethnic origin group reported British as their ethnic identity ( $3 \%$ single response, $3 \%$ British only) and $4 \%$ reported French ( $3 \%$ single, $1 \%$ French only). The remaining $3 \%$ reported a multiple response Canadian ( $2 \%$ Canadian and British, 1\% Canadian and other).

The Canadian response reported in $Q .15$ by the sample receiving questionnaires listing Canadian as an example ethnic group was more stable in the transfer of the Canadian response to $\mathbf{Q} .16$ (identity). For example, $90 \%$ of the group reporting Canadian in $Q .15$ also gave Canadian in



Table 13: Transfer of Q. 15 Ethnic Groups to Q. 16 Single Response Canadian, NCT-2, Canada.

| Q.16 Single Response Canadian |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Q15 Ethnic Groups | without <br> Canadian <br> questionnaire |


| British | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| French | 2 | 1 |
| Canadian | 28 | 41 |
| European | 11 | 3 |
| West Asian | - | - |
| Arab | - | - |
| South Asian | - | - |
| Asian | - | - |
| Black | 1 | - |
| British only | 6 | 6 |
| Canadian \& British | 3 | 8 |
| Canadian \& French | - | 2 |
| Canadian \& Other | 8 | 6 |
| British \& French | 2 | 1 |
| Canadian, British |  |  |
| French | 1 | 1 |
| British \& Other | 12 | 9 |
| French \& Other | 1 | 1 |
| Canadian, British |  |  |
| \& Other | 4 | 4 |
| Canadian, French |  |  |
| \& Other | - | - |
| Canadian. British |  |  |
| French \& Other | 1 | - |
| British. French |  |  |
| \& Other | 1 | 1 |
| Other, Other | 8 | 4 |
| Non-response | 7 | 5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[^3]Q.16. Just $6 \%$ of this Q. 15 Canadian group failed to answer the ethnic identity question. A further 4\% gave a response other than Canadian (Table 12).
2.4 Summary: Response Canadian, NCT-2

1. The level of Canadian was reduced in the NCT-2 open-ended format compared with the $\mathrm{NCT}-1$ mark-box format which showed Canadian as a mark-box category on the questionnaire.
2. The count for Canadian increased, when Canadian was cited in the list of example ethnic groups.
3. Francophones, Quebecers and those 25 years and older were more likely to report Canadian when Canadian was cited in the list of example ethnic groups on the questionnaire.
4. The size and characteristics of the population reporting Canadian to questions on ethnic origin and ethnic identity can be influenced by the format of the questionnaire (open-ended or mark-box) and also by listing Canadian as an example ethnic group on the questionnaire.
5. The Canadian response reported by the sample receiving questionnaires not citing Canadian as an example ethic group showed a weaker transfer of the canadian response to the ethnic identity question compared with the group receiving the questionnaire listing Canadian as an ethnic group. The non-response was $4 x$ higher in the transfer of Canadian between $Q .15$ and $Q .16$ for the non-Canadian questionnaire sample compared with the Canadian example questionnaire group.
Q.15, Origins of Parents and Grandparents

In NCT-1, due to the high response of Canadian, the distribution of the British, French and European groups differed markedly from those obtained by the 1986 Census. As well, multiple responses increased in $Q .15$ (NCT-1) compared with the 1986 Census.

A similar pattern occurred in NCT-2. The Canadian response, though reduced from the NCT-1 test, continued to alter the distribution of the British, French and European groups compared with the counts obtained in the 1986 Census.

The NCT-2 French response was stronger compared with NCT-1 largely because of a lower Canadian count. In the sample receiving questionnaires not citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups, the population reporting French as the origin of their parents and grandparents was 15\%. In the sample receiving questionnaires citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups, $9 \%$ of respondents reported French Table 14).

When the sizeable non-response group is reallocated the French rises correspondingly to $18 \%$ in the sample which did not receive the questionnaires showing Canadian as an example ethnic group and to $10 \%$ in the sample which did receive questionnaires citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups. Thus for the sample not receiving questionnaires citing Canadian as an example ethnic group, the percentage reporting French increased, but did not reach the 1986 ethnic origin level of $24 \%$.

Please note that the British/French multiples remained high in the NCT-2 sample in receipt of questionnaires not citing Canadian. It is likely that respondents who would have reported French in 1986 may have provided a multiple 20

Figure 1:
COMPARISON OF RESPONSES BY ETHNIC GROUP, FOR ETHNIC ORIGINS OF PARENTS AND GRANDPARENTS (NCT-1, Q.15), ETHNIC IDENTITY (NCT-1, Q.16) AND 1986 CENSUS ETHNIC ORIGIN


Table 14: Ethnic group responee, 0.15 and O.18, Canada, NCT-2

| Elinnic <br> Groupe | 0.15 |  | 0.18 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Without Canadian Count ( 000 's) | $\%$ | With <br> Canad Count ( 000 's) | 4 | Witho <br> Canad <br> Count ( 000 's) | * | With <br> Canad Count ( 000 's) | 46 |
| TOTAL(1) | 12,962 | 100.00 | 12,713 | 100.00 | 12,982 | 100.00 | 12.713 | 100.00 |
| BRITISH............. | 1.478 | 11.41 | 1.431 | 11.26 | 2,666 | 20.58 | 1.800 | 14.18 |
| FRENCH.............. | 1.918 | 14.80 | 1.120 | 8.81 | 1.992 | 15.37 | 1.138 | 8.93 |
| ABORIGINAL.......... | 27 | 0.21 | 30 | 0.24 | 35 | 0.27 | 36 | 0.28 |
| CANAOIAN............ | 458 | 3.54 | 1.669 | 13.13 | 1.018 | 7.84 | 3.616 | 28.44 |
| WEST EUROPEAN....... | 421 | 3.25 | 416 | 3.27 | 423 | 3.28 | 328 | 2.58 |
| NORTH EUROPEAN....... | 81 | 0.47 | 83 | 0.65 | 67 | 0.52 | 79 | 0.82 |
| EAST EUROPEAN....... | 350 | 2.70 | 274 | 2.18 | 358 | 2.78 | 260 | 2.04 |
| SOUTH EUROPEAN....... | 512 | 3.85 | 470 | 3.70 | 475 | 3.68 | 477 | 3.75 |
| JEWISH.............. | 11 | 0.08 | 77 | 0.81 | 38 | 0.28 | 71 | 0.58 |
| WEST ASIAN........ | 6 | 0.05 | 5 | 0.04 | 6 | 0.05 | 5 | 0.04 |
| ARAB............... | 67 | 0.52 | 29 | 0.23 | 101 | 0.78 | 22 | 0.17 |
| SOUTH ASIAN......... | 127 | 0.98 | 48 | 0.38 | 108 | 0.83 | 31 | 0.25 |
| INDO-CHINESE........ | 1 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.01 | 25 | 0.19 |
| CHINESE............ | 287 | 2.06 | 250 | 1.97 | 278 | 2.15 | 242 | 1.91 |
| KOREAN.............. | 13 | 0.10 | 5 | 0.04 | 11 | 0.08 | 5 | 0.04 |
| JAPANESE............ | 11 | 0.08 | 13 | 0.10 | 11 | 0.08 | 13 | 0.10 |
| FILIPINO.......... | 35 | 0.27 | 21 | 0.17 | 35 | 0.27 | 25 | 0.20 |
| OTHER EAST-S.E ASIAN. | 6 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.00 | 8 | 0.05 | 1 | 0.01 |
| PAC. IS............. | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| LAT. CENT. \& SO. AM.. | 7 | 0.05 | 4 | 0.03 | 20 | 0.18 | 4 | 0.03 |
| CARRIBEAN........... | 18 | 0.14 | 51 | 0.40 | 30 | 0.23 | 55 | 0.43 |
| BLACK............... | 10 | 0.08 | 10 | 0.12 | 31 | 0.24 | 0 | 0.05 |
| OTHER AFRICAN....... | 1 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 0.02 | 5 | 0.04 |
| OTHER............... | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 0.03 | 15 | 0.11 | 33 | 0.28 |
| SINGLE ORIGINS...... | 5.807 | 44.80 | 6,018 | 47.34 | 7.721 | 58.57 | 8.270 | 65.10 |
| BR. ONLY............ | 1,121 | 8.65 | 897 | 7.08 | 369 | 2.84 | 333 | 2.62 |
| BRIT \& FRE.......... | 495 | 3.82 | 476 | 3.74 | 248 | 1.90 | 134 | 1.05 |
| BRIT \& OTHER....... | 1.644 | 12.69 | 1.704 | 13.40 | 672 | 5.18 | 611 | 4.80 |
| CAN. \&. BR........ | 118 | 0.02 | 502 | 3.95 | 144 | 1.11 | 270 | 2.12 |
| CAN. \&. BR \& OTH... | 85 | 0.65 | 278 | 2.17 | 22 | 0.17 | 48 | 0.38 |
| ERIT \& OTH (res)... | 1.441 | 11.11 | 028 | 7.28 | 506 | 3.91 | 293 | 2.30 |
| FRE ONLY............ | 149 | 1.15 | 68 | 0.53 | 68 | 0.53 | 23 | 0.18 |
| FRE \& OTHER......... | 383 | 2.80 | 422 | 3.32 | 154 | 1.19 | 223 | 1.75 |
| CAN \& FR........... | 14 | 0.11 | 210 | 1.70 | 14 | 0.11 | 132 | 1.04 |
| CAN \& FR \& OTH.... | 0 | 0.00 | 11 | 0.09 | 0 | 0.00 | 7 | 0.05 |
| FR \& OTH (ree).... | 349 | 2.69 | 194 | 1.53 | 140 | 1.08 | 84 | 0.68 |
| BR. FR. \& OTH........ | 282 | 2.02 | 249 | 1.96 | 63 | 0.48 | 30 | 0.23 |
| CAN \& BR. \& FR..... | 11 | 0.08 | 88 | 0.69 | 1 | 0.01 | 8 | 0.06 |
| CON \& BR. \& FR. \& OT | 9 | 0.07 | 24 | 0.19 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 8R. $\&$ FR. \& OTH (res) | 242 | 1.87 | 137 | 1.08 | 81 | 0.47 | 21 | 0.17 |
| OTHER............... | 884 | 7.59 | 1.093 | 8.59 | 460 | 3.55 | 531 | 4.18 |
| CDN \& OTHER........ | 182 | 1.41 | 338 | 2.68 | 177 | 1.38 | 280 | 2.20 |
| OTHER (res)........ | 801 | 6.18 | 755 | 5.94 | 283 | 2.18 | 251 | 1.98 |
| TOTAL MULT........... | 5.019 | 38.71 | 4.908 | 38.61 | 2.032 | 15.87 | 1.885 | 14.83 |
| NON-REPONSE.......... | 2.138 | 16.49 | 1.787 | 14.05 | 3.210 | 24.76 | 2.553 | 20.08 |
| NON-RESPONSE....... | 1.711 | 13.20 | 1.403 | 11.03 | 2.888 | 22.28 | 2.282 | 17.80 |
| INVALIO............ | 413 | 3.19 | 358 | 2.82 | 307 | 2.37 | 275 | 2.17 |
| OITTO.............. | 13 | 0.10 . | 20 | 0.21 | 17 | 0.13 | 15 | 0.12 |

response of French in the NCT-2 test (sample which did not receive questionnaires showing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups).

British -- Q. 15

As shown in Table 14, the NCT-2 British estimate (origins of parents and grandparents) was not affected by questionnaire type. About 1.48 million ( $11 \%$ ) reported British in the non-Canadian questionnaire sample compared with 1.44 million ( $11 \%$ ) in the sample receiving questionnaires listing Canadian.

Graph 2 shows once the data are adjusted for non-response, the $N C T-1$ and $N C T-2$ single response British estimate was about $14 \%$. This estimates is nearly $55 \%$ that of the 1986 census count for British.

The British Only multiple was higher in NCT-2 sample receiving questionnaires not citing Canadian (9\%) compared with the Canadian sample group (7\%). The British and other multiple was also greater in the non-Canadian questionnaire sample: 11\% compared with the sample receiving questionnaires citing Canadian as an example ethnic group -- 7\%.

FIGURE 2:
COMPARISON OF 1986, NCT-1 AND NCT-2 RESULTS FOR ETHNIC ORIGIN AND ORIGINS OF PARENTS AND GRANDPARENTS QUESTIONS, CANADA


European Groups -- Q. 15

The estimate of respondents with European origins was slightly higher in the NCT-2 $Q .15$ sample population in receipt of the non-Canadian questionnaires compared with the Canadian sample group: 1.36 million compared with 1.32 million (Table 14). When the data are adjusted for non-response, the NCT-2 estimates approximate the estimates obtained in NCT-2. However, the NCT-1 and NCT-2 estimates for European ethnic groups (13\%) are lower compared with the 1986 Census (16\%).

Asian/Arab/Other Groups -- Q. 15

Due to the variance in the sample data it is not possible to say anything meaningful about most of the individual Asian, Arab and other groups. It is worthwhile noting the NCT-2 Chinese count remained strong (Table 14). This is a group which has been increasing because of strong immigration flows. It would therefore be appropriate for respondents to report chinese as the origin of their parents and grandparents.

Single and Multiple Response -- Q. 15

In 1986, the level of multiple response was 28\%, a seemingly high level at the time. The level of multiple
response has not been improved by the change to 'parents and grandparents' from the concept of 'ancestor'.

In NCT-1, the level of multiple response to $Q .15$ was 41\%. In an open-ended question for the sample which received questionnaires not citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups, $45 \%$ of respondents reported more than one group. This level fell to $44 \%$ in the sample which received questionnaires showing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups.

### 3.2 Ethnic Identity, 0.16

The NCT-1 ethnic identity counts for the non-Canadian ethnic groups differed from the 1986 ethnic origin group counts and the estimates obtained from the NCT-1 Q. 15 (origins of parents and parents). The estimates obtained for ethnic groups based on the NCT-2 ethnic identity question also differed from the estimates obtained in NCT-1, NCT-2 Q. 15 and the 1986 Census (Table 14).

The strong Canadian response in both NCT-1 and NCT-2 lowered the British, French and European counts from the levels obtained in the 1986 Census. Multiple response counts reported in $Q .16 \mathrm{NCT}-1$ and NCT-2 were lower compared with the 1986 Census and the question on the origins of parents and grandparents (NCT-1, NCT-2).

French -- Q. 16

In NCT-1, the estimated single response count for French (ethnic identity) was 10\%. This was lower compared with the 1986 Census ethnic origin count of $24 \%$. In NCT-2, for the sample not receiving questionnaires citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups, $15 \%$ of respondents reported French. Of respondents receiving questionnaires citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups $9 \%$ reported French (Table 14). It is also interesting to note that the level of multiple French response was stronger in Q. 15 compared with Q. 16 .

When the transfer of responses between Q. 15 and Q. 16 is examined (sample not receiving questionnaires citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups), $16 \%$ of the NCT-2 Q. 16 French identity response was comprised of those who had previously reported a French multiple response to Q.15. When the transfer of responses between Q. 15 and Q.16 is examined (sample receiving questionnaires showing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups), $18 \%$ of the respondents reporting a French ethnic identity had given answered French and other to the question on the origins of parents and grandparents (Q.15).

Table 15: Ethnic group response adjusted for non-response, Q. 15 and Q.16. Canada, NCT-2


British -- Q. 16

Compared with 1986, both the NCT-2 and NCT-1 British estimates were lower. Interestingly, the British count tended to be higher in $Q .16$ compared with $Q .15$ in both the NCT-1 and NCT-2 surveys.

In NCT-2, the British count was stronger in the sample receiving questionnaires not citing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups. In this sample the transfer from Q. 15 to Q. 16 came from respondents who reported British Only or British and other in Q.15. This group gave a single response British or Canadian and British in Q.16.

European Groups -- Q. 16

About 1.36 million respondents reported a European ethnic identity. This figure remained stable between Q. 15 and Q. 16 for the sample receiving questionnaires not citing Canadian as an example ethnic group. The Canadian questionnaire sample group had a lower European estimate: 1.26 million.

Figure 3:

## COMPARISON OF 1986, NCT-1 AND NCT-2 RESULTS FOR ETHNIC

 ORIGIN AND ETHNIC IDENTITY, CANADA

Figure 4:
RESULTS FOR Q. 15-ORIGINS OF PARENTS AND GRANDPARENTS AND O. 16-ETHNIC IDENTITY BY ETHNIC GROUP AND QUESTIONNAIRE TYPE, CANADA, NCT-2

*Data adjusted for non-response

Asian/Arab/Other Ethnic Groups -- Q. 16

The NCT-2 estimates of the Asian, Arab and other groups based on the $Q .16$ ethnic identity questions were stronger in the sample not receiving questionnaires showing Canadian as an example ethnic group.

Single/Multiple Response

In 1986, the level of multiple ethnic origin response was 28\%. In NCT-1, the level of multiple ethnic identity response (Q.16) was less: 25\%.

In NCT-2, $21 \%$ of the sample receiving questionnaires not showing Canadian in the list of example ethnic groups reported more than one ethnic group. Of those who received questionnaires citing Canadian in the list example ethnic groups, $19 \%$ percent of respondents gave more than one group.

1. The NCT-2 open-ended ethnic origin and ethnic identity questions resulted in an unacceptable high level of non-response.
2. The level of Canadian response to the ethnic origin and ethnic identity questions can be affected by question design: mark-box or open-ended. In NCT-2, the incidence of Canadian increased when Canadian was cited as an example ethnic group. The characteristics of the population reporting Canadian changes depending on the question and its format.
3. The level of multiple response was not lowered by asking respondents to report the origins of their parents and grandparents.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Return to the 1986 ethnic origin format: respondents to report on the ethnic or cultural origins of their ancestors. This should reduce the incidence of Canadian.
```
NCT-2 With Canadian
```

15. What are the ethnic or cultural origins of this person's parents and grandparents?
Specify up to 4 groups, if applicable.
(For example, French, English, Irish, German, Italian, Ukrainian, Jewish, Polish, Chinese, North American Indian, Métis, InuitEskimo. Fripino, Indian from India, Arab, Armenian, Haitian, Mexican. Canadian, Afro-American, etc.)

See guide at end of questionnaire.
Specify ethnic or cultural groups
16. What is this person's etthnic or cultural identity?

Specify up to 4 groups, if applicable.
(For example, French, English, Irish, German, Halian, Ukrainian, Jewish, Polish, Chinese, North American Indian, Métis, InuittEskimo. Filipino, Indian from India. Arab, Armenian, Haitian, Mexican, Canadian, Alro-American, etc.)

See guide at end of questionnaire.


Specify ethnic or cultural groups


M North American Indian, Métis or InuitEskimo. specity Indian Band or First Nation or Tribe (for example: Cross Lake indian Band, Haida Nation, inuvialuit)


NCT-2 Without Canadian
15. What are the ethnic or cultural origins of this person's parents and grandparents?
Specify up to 4 groups, if applicable.
(For example, French, English, Irish, German. Italian, Ukrainian, Jewish, Polish, Chinese, North American Indian. Métis, Inuit/Eskimo. Filipino. Indian from India, Arab. Armenian, Haitian, Mexican, Afro-American, etc.)

See guide at end of questionnaire.
16. What is this person's ethnic or cultural identity?

Specity up to 4 groups, it applicable.
(For example, French, English, Irish, German, Italian, Ukrainian, Jewish, Polish, Chinese, North American Indian, Métis, InuitEskimo. Flipino, indian from India. Arab. Armenian. Haitian. Mexican, Afro-American, etc.)

See guide at end of questionnaire.



[^0]:    Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished data.

    - Adjusted for non-response.

[^1]:    Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished NCT-2 weighted data

[^2]:    Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished NCT-1 weighted data

[^3]:    Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished data.
    Wsightad data.

