

Integrating Better but Multilingually: Language Practices of South Asian Immigrants for Settlement and Integration in Canada

Kashif Raza¹
University of Calgary, Canada

Abstract: Canadian Index for Measuring Integration (CIMI) is used by researchers, policy analysts, and government agencies to evaluate newcomer performance against the local-born population across four dimensions: economic, social, political, and health. Despite recognizing integration as a multidimensional and complex phenomenon, the index mainly evaluates the achievement of the four dimensions but without looking at how they are achieved (e.g., the role of different languages) and the type of integration (narrowed or broader) taking place. One underlying assumption can be that since Canada is a bilingual country, one of the official languages must be used for settlement and integration. However, as this study finds, this may not reflect the social reality of the Canadian society where diverse immigrant populations capitalize on official and non-official languages for settlement and integration. Utilizing the four dimensions with language as an additional variable, this quantitative study reports findings from 493 participants from a sub-group of South Asians from Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan who are able to settle and integrate better when English and ethnic languages are used for socio-politico-economic and health integration. In addition to reporting micro-level multilingual integration supported by ethnic concentrations, this study calls for further investigation of the type of integration in ethnic concentrations and its long-term implications for the Canadian society.

Keywords: Canadian Index for Measuring Integration (CIMI), multilingualism and integration, settlement and integration, South Asian immigrants.

Immigrant, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) utilizes an index called Canadian Index for Measuring Integration (CIMI) to evaluate newcomer (born outside of Canada) performance against the local population (Canada born). This index includes four dimensions: economic (40%), social (30%), civic and democratic participation (20%), and health (10%). These dimensions further include multiple indicators (e.g., employment status in the economic dimension, having friends in social integration, volunteering in civic and democratic participation, and having a doctor in health) that are used to evaluate newcomer achievement of the four dimensions and highlight areas where their performance is weaker compared to the local population. The CIMI uses quantitative data from multiple sources, such as the Canadian Census, National Household Survey, and General Society Survey, and works as an instrument for researchers and policy analysts to get an estimate of newcomers and their performance in the four areas (e.g., Etowa et al., 2021).

¹ Corresponding Author: A Sessional Instructor and PhD Candidate at Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary, Canada. E-Mail: Kashif.raza@ucalgary.ca

CIMI is appreciated for recognizing integration as a complex and multidimensional phenomenon (Guo & Guo, 2016) and drawing results from multiple data sources. However, it focuses on the achievement of the four dimensions of integration, without looking at how these dimensions are achieved by the newcomers (e.g., the role of different languages in their achievement) and the type of integration taking place at the social level among diverse immigrant populations (e.g., broader social integration with diverse communities or narrowed integration that is tilted towards co-ethnic members). This calls for problematizing its conception of integration (happening through English or French only) and its impact on understanding and interpreting integration of newcomers for possible policy revisions or new initiatives.

This paper is concerned with the first observation (i.e., the role of different languages in achieving the four dimensions of integration) but also points to future research to investigate the second concern (i.e., the type of integration taking place at the social level). In this paper, the main theory that informs the problematization of the CIMI and its conception of integration (that does not include language as an important component of integration) is the sociology of language (Fishman, 1971) where language is a social value and shapes human behavior not only about a particular language but also about its users (Severo & Görski, 2017). This means that social dynamics such as relationships, social status, and sense of belonging are impacted by individual and group language use and require investigation to understand how individuals or groups associate themselves with certain languages or language groups (Fishman, 1971).

For immigrants, for instance, this would mean exploring their language practices to understand how they are using different languages to settle and integrate in their new home (Abdulrahim & Baker, 2009), the type of integration taking place, and the impact this may have for the broader society and the country (Raza & Chua, 2022). Since language is an important component of immigrant settlement and integration (e.g., Abdulrahim & Baker, 2009; Capstick, 2021) as it provides a medium through which immigrants interact with the resources (e.g., immigration policy, settlement services, and people) in their new home, I employ Fishman's (1971) theory of the sociology of language that "focuses on the entire gamut of topics related to the social organization of language behavior, including not only language use per se but also language attitudes and overt behaviors towards language and toward language users" (p. 217). With this theoretical lens, the intention is to understand how English and other languages are used by immigrants for social, economic, political and health purposes and how they influence immigrant integration across the four dimensions of integration in Canada.

Although CIMI includes non-official language usage at work as an indicator in the economic dimension, it does not investigate the use of Canada's official (English and French) and other languages for other indicators or dimensions. An underlying assumption in the CIMI could be that since Canada is a bilingual country and newcomers, especially skilled immigrants, showcase their official language skills through language testing (Raza & Chua, 2020), they may be using one of the official languages to settle and integrate in the country. However, the literature on immigrant settlement and integration and an overview of the provincial policies and initiatives for language support in Alberta (where this study took place) (e.g., *Multicultural Strategy for Communications and Engagement* by the City of Calgary) show that language is a significant variable and may impact settlement and integration of immigrants.

Literature on immigrants in Canada (e.g., Ferdous et al., 2018; Hynie et al., 2011; Li & Li, 2016; Vahabi & Lofters, 2016) indicates that language (whether knowledge of official languages or usage of non-official languages) impacts newcomer settlement and integration (positively and negatively). For instance, Ferdous et al. (2018) identified a lack of official language competence as one of the significant barriers to cervical cancer screening and health maintenance among

immigrant women in Canada, who showed a tendency towards similar lingo-cultural physicians because of the linguistic and cultural support. Similarly, Hynie et al. (2011) concluded that many immigrant women tended to join their co-ethnic networks for mental and social support, friendships, and information-sharing because of shared linguistic repertoires and lower English language skills. Shuva's (2021) study on newly arrived Bangladeshi immigrants in Ontario found the use of ethnic community social media forums for settlement purposes such as housing, job, and lifestyle in Canada. Such networks are additional to governmental services and platforms and are often preferred because of ethnic language support (e.g., Capstick, 2021).

Different provincial and city governments in Canada also recognize the significance of providing access to information in different languages. For instance, in Alberta, the City Government of Calgary initiated the *Multicultural Strategy for Communications and Engagement* in 2017 to accommodate the linguistic diversity of its immigrant population by translating important information about key topics like taxes and transportation in major immigrant languages such as Arabic, Indian Punjabi, Mandarin, Spanish, and Tagalog. Additionally, City staff are provided in-person and online training about the project to enhance its impact (The City of Calgary, 2018).

For these reasons, it is important to learn how immigrants are using their linguistic repertoire to achieve the four dimensions of integration, the type of integration taking place, its outcomes for the Canadian society, and whether there is a need to revisit the current integration approach. Since one objective of this paper is to argue for the inclusion of language as an indicator for measuring integration across diverse immigrant communities, it is aimed at providing empirical evidence about the use of different languages during settlement and integration to understand the extent to which official languages are used to integrate, whether integration is happening beyond the official languages, and how different languages are used to achieve the four dimensions of the CIMI index. This paper is part of a bigger doctoral study that is aimed at answering all these questions by doing a mixed-methods explanatory case study of a sub-group of South Asian diaspora from Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan; however, the current paper reports the first part that uses quantitative methods to collect baseline data about the language practices of the sub-group. As the survey (Appendix 1) included specific questions that measured the use of different languages (official and non-official) across the four dimensions of integration outlined by the CIMI, the findings will help understand how multilingualism helps this group of immigrants settle and integrate. The main research question that guided the survey study was: How do South Asians in Calgary use official and ethnic languages for economic, social, civic and democratic participation, and health purposes?

Literature Review

Language, Economy, and Integration

Research on language and economy points to the ways language can impact the economy and vice versa (Grin, 2003). The perspective of language use in economic activities derives from language as a human capital or human capital theory. In the Bourdieusian world, this capital can be a resource, a linguistic capital, where social, cultural, or economic values are associated based on competence and expertise in certain linguistic resources (Swartz, 2012). This often defines a language speaker's employment prospects and earnings. In terms of newly arrived immigrants in Canada, especially the family members of principal applicants who can accompany them to Canada but are not required to take the IELTS exam to qualify for residency, research has shown that

proficiency in the official language(s) is one of the challenges in finding employment (e.g., Fong & Shen, 2011). This often results in finding work within ethnic economies as an alternative, which has shown mixed results regarding the economic integration of newcomers. For instance, Fong and Shen (2011) compared concentrations of Chinese workers in industrial sectors in Calgary, Toronto, and Vancouver to examine the impact of the ethnic economy on the employment of co-ethnic employees. Their findings revealed an over-representation of Chinese businessmen and workers in certain fields like textile, clothing, and food preparation. This over-representation is maintained by cheap co-ethnic labor that is attracted to these ethnically dominated sectors because of unrecognized educational qualifications in the mainstream economy, the use of ethnic languages in business operations, and shared socio-cultural backgrounds.

Similar results are reported by Agarwal (2013) about Filipinos in health sector (e.g., nurses, health technicians, and health support service providers) where their ethnic concentration has produced positive results. While such ethnic economies or concentrations provide employment opportunities for co-ethnic members of a particular group (e.g., Chinese or South Asians), other groups and ethnicities (e.g., Africans, Mexicans) may be underrepresented in some sectors, resulting in unequal work opportunities for different groups. Additionally, the economic support that ethnic concentrations provide also varies across different groups depending upon which sector they are in the majority. For example, while Chinese and Filipino workers received support in the sectors mentioned above, “there is little benefit to concentrations of Bangladeshis and Pakistanis doing manual labour, janitorial work, service jobs or shift work in manufacturing and administrative support and waste management sectors” (Agarwal, 2013, p. 26). Similarly, Li and Li (2016) used ‘language used at work’ as a variable to measure the earnings difference between Chinese workers in Canada who work in the mainstream economy (where the official language [English] was used) versus immigrant ethnic economies (where Mandarin was the main language of communication). Their findings indicated that although workers in the ethnic economies earn lesser than their counterparts in the mainstream economy, “connections to the immigrant economic enclaves provide a cushion for immigrants to lessen the relative earnings disadvantage in the enclave produced mainly by unequal returns to human capital” (Li & Li, 2016, p. 149).

Although these findings show that ethnic enclave economies provide alternative employment opportunities to newcomers with less human capital, such as lower proficiency in the official language (English or French) (also see Hynie et al., 2011), they also invite studying how other language skills (i.e., ethnic languages) are used as alternatives or additional languages for work and the impact this may have on the economic integration of different ethnic groups, especially when they earn lesser than their counterparts in the mainstream economy (Li & Li, 2016) and result in the over-representation of particular ethnicities in certain fields (Agarwal, 2013; Fong & Shen, 2011). Similarly, although such practices may create better work opportunities for co-ethnic members, they may result in stronger ethnic economies and further segregation of society (Osaghae & Cooney, 2019).

Language, Society, and Integration

Since language is a social practice, it plays an important role in shaping social interactions and relations. People connect with each other through language to form social networks that consist of formal and informal relationships comprising family, friends, and community (Milroy, 1980). Sociolinguistics and sociologists of language are particularly interested in the ways language shapes these relationships and the implications these relationships may have for society and its members (Fishman, 1971). For this, there is always a need to explore the use of language in a

particular context, such as the settlement of newcomers in the host country and the use of language to create and/or join social groups for integration where their ethnic languages are used (Capstick, 2021; Hynie et al., 2011).

Research on ethnic networks has revealed that certain ethnic groups, especially Chinese and South Asians, tend to live near their co-ethnic members because of high levels of social capital (Hiebert, 2014; Qadeer et al., 2010). For example, Agarwal and Kurtz (2019) have noted that Edmonton and Calgary have become top destinations for Chinese and South Asian immigrants because of the social and cultural institutions (e.g., faith centers, ethnic stores, and ethnic schools) that contribute to their settlement in Alberta. Portes (1998) defined social capital as a combination of trust, embedded relationships, and support networks. Since language and its use is of interest to applied linguistics, they are interested in studying how language contributes to social capital, especially in relation to developing trust, relationship, and networking among social actors such as friends, family, local community, and the mainstream society (Milroy, 1980).

In terms of newcomers in Canada, research has revealed the use of ethnic languages for creating and benefitting from social networking for settlement and integration. Hynie et al. (2011) explored the sources of informal support available to newcomer women in Toronto through their social networks across seven different cultural-linguistic communities such as Spanish-speaking Latinos, Urdu-speaking Pakistanis, and Portuguese-speaking Brazilians. Their findings revealed that in addition to support from governmental agencies, five informal sources of support were helpful during the initial years of settlement: “immediate family, transnational family, friendship networks, close friends, and community” (p. 35). Similarly, Shuva’s (2021) study of Bangladeshi immigrants in Toronto revealed the use of online resources such as co-ethnic community forums, YouTube videos, and immigration-related blogs in Bengali and English to learn about Canadian life, immigration policies, Bengali community, and employment opportunities. These studies show the importance of ethnic languages in connecting newcomers to their family, friends, and community for emotional and settlement support (Hynie et al., 2011).

Language, Civic and Democratic Participation, and Integration

The civic and democratic participation of foreign-born citizens, especially those who live in ethnically concentrated places, has become an area of interest for political scientists and immigration studies specialists. A 2015 United Nations report on migrants and their socio-economic integration associates social participation through volunteering with developing a sense of belonging to the new community as well as creating communal harmony across different ethnic groups (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe [UNECE], 2015). This can have a greater impact on the social integration of newcomers. A report by Vezina and Houle (2017) on the settlement patterns and social integration of newcomers in Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver showed that “residents of neighbourhoods where the population with an immigrant background is moderately concentrated (50% to 70% of the total population) are more likely to be part of an immigrant or ethnic organization than their counterparts” (p. 41) outside immigrant concentrations. This shows that ethnocultural associations and immigrant organizations continue to remain the places of volunteering and mutual support among newcomer volunteers. The same report also revealed that “89% of the population with an immigrant background reported a somewhat strong or very strong sense of belonging with people who have the same mother tongue, compared with 85% for attachment to people of the same ethnicity or culture” (Vezina & Houle, 2017, p. 42). This means that shared lingo-cultural characteristics are stronger reasons for group belonging and social integration among immigrants who live in their concentrations.

In terms of political engagement, a lower turn-out among foreign-born immigrants, especially visible minority groups like Chinese and South Asians, was also reported in Canada during 2000 and 2004 elections (Tossutti, 2007). According to Tossutti (2007), “eligible voters from Chinese, South Asian and black backgrounds voted at lower rates in the previous federal, provincial and municipal elections compared to non-visible voters (primarily of European origin) from the same birthplace group” (p. 19). Factors that result in such lower political participation include political experiences in country of origin, negative attitude towards immigrants, and language barrier (Li, 1998; Tossutti, 2007). What remains a curiosity is that despite electoral outreach initiatives in multiple languages (e.g., initiatives during the 2006 federal elections such as the publication of *Voter Information Guide* in 26 languages, multilingual advertisements in 95 minority languages, multilingual call centers in 100 languages, and ethnocultural community liaison officers) (Elections Canada, 2006), immigrant participation in elections is still unsatisfactory. Since language barrier has been reported as one of the factors for lower political engagement (e.g., Tossutti, 2007), it calls for investigating how such a barrier can be broken to increase the political participation of diverse communities in Canada.

Language, Health, and Integration

Mental and physical health are considered pivotal for the sustainable integration of newcomers. In this regard, having a family doctor, doing necessary tests and follow-up visits, and maintaining good health are used as indicators of health integration in the host country. Research (e.g., Cunningham et al., 2008) indicates that there is a higher tendency of immigration among healthier people; however, they are vulnerable to higher health risks if they fail to adjust themselves according to host country environmental conditions, food habits/restrictions, local diseases, and other medical conditions. Earlier research has pointed to health-related challenges faced by newcomers in host countries. These include environmental risks, detrimental lifestyle habits, “stress of resettlement, discrimination, and ‘othering’” (Lebrun, 2012, p. 1065), and poor knowledge of illnesses and treatment options (Clarke & Isphording, 2016). In order to cope with these challenges, knowledge about the health facilities in the host country as well as utilization of health services and resources are necessary.

Since language is the medium through which knowledge about health services can be gained and utilized, researchers have investigated how proficiency in the host country’s language impacts newcomers’ mental and physical health (Abdulrahim & Baker, 2009; Ferdous et al., 2018). Lebrun (2012) examined the impact of length of stay and official/dominant language proficiency on health care experiences of immigrants in Canada and the U.S. Data analysis from 2007-2008 Canadian Community Health Survey and the National Health Interview Survey revealed that while access to healthcare was better in Canada, shorter length of stay and language proficiency were barriers in both countries. Alba and Sweningson (2006) analyzed data from the 2000 National Health Interview Survey and found that “low English language proficiency is a barrier to receive a recommendation for Pap smear [a cervical cancer screening test] among Hispanic women not up to date with cervical cancer screening” in the United States (p. 292). Similar results are reported by Ferdous et al. (2018), where a lack of proficiency in the official languages of Canada (English/French) resulted in lower cervical cancer screening of immigrant women.

Realizing the language barrier among diverse immigrant populations, certain initiatives have been taken in different Canadian provinces and cities to provide services in dominant immigrant languages. For instance, Alberta Health Services (AHS) provides interpretation and translation services in many languages, such as Arabic, Mandarin, Punjabi, Spanish, and Urdu

(AHS, 2023). Such services mitigate the language barrier for non-English/French speaking patients as they can access health care services in ethnic or non-official languages. Ravichandiran et al. (2022) reported that 15.6% of the respondents to the Canadian Community Health Survey 2015-2016 who regularly visited their health care providers used a non-official language for communication. Other studies (e.g., Ferdous et al., 2018; Vahabi & Lofters, 2016) have also reported immigrants' preference for same language health care providers in the Canadian context. This calls for further investigating how a multilingual healthcare system contributes to the integration of newcomers to Canada and how people use official and non-official languages to access healthcare facilities.

Context of the Study

This study took place in Calgary, Alberta. The province of Alberta was chosen because of its emergence as one of the top destinations for newcomers to Canada. As per the 2022 Annual Report to the Parliament on Immigration, 40,041 (9.9%) Permanent Residents were admitted in Alberta in 2021, which made it the fourth top destination after Ontario, British Columbia, and Quebec (Government of Canada, 2022). In addition to bringing socio-politico-economic benefits to Alberta and Canada, these immigrants also bring different social practices, cultures, and languages. The top ten languages identified by immigrants to Alberta in the 2016 census were (in order of higher to lower ranking) Tagalog, German, French, Punjabi, Cantonese, Spanish, Mandarin, Arabic, Urdu, and Vietnamese. In addition, the percentage of immigrant mother tongues spoken in Alberta has gone higher over the years, from 20.6% in 2011 to 22.3% in 2016, an increase higher than any other Canadian province (Government of Alberta, 2018). The 2016 census also revealed that although English is still the most common language spoken at home, with 82.6% speaking it alone, Tagalog has emerged as the second most common language spoken solely at home by Albertans (12.0%), followed by Punjabi (1.3%), and Cantonese (1.0%). What is interesting to note in this census report compared with the previous one is a 72.9% increase in bilingual speakers who speak English and another language at home. Although the report does not provide any information about Albertans who speak more than two languages at home, it acknowledges that the increase in bilingual speakers is due to the recent growth of non-official languages in the province.

Although English is a dominant language in Alberta, the provincial and city governments have started to realize that equitable access to resources could be enhanced by providing services in English as well as immigrant languages. An example of such realization is the *Multilingual Communications and Engagement Initiative* (The City of Calgary, 2018) which is aimed at accommodating the linguistic diversity of the city's diverse immigrant population by translating important information into major immigrant languages. As a starting point, information about topics such as taxes and transportation is being translated into top four non-official languages (Chinese, Punjabi, Filipino, and Latino). Similarly, AHS (2023), Calgary Police (Calgary Police Service, 2023), and other government bodies provide services in different languages. However, there is little information available about the effectiveness of such initiatives and how they impact newcomer integration. This study is aimed at filling this gap by providing empirical evidence about the use of different languages during settlement and integration in Calgary, Alberta, through an investigation of the language practices of a sub-group of South Asians who may live or work in the Northeast part of Calgary.

The main reason for choosing Northeast Calgary as a research site and a sub-group of South Asian multilingual speakers from Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan as participants was because they are a visible ethnic group in the area (Government of Alberta, 2018) and are known to live with their co-ethnic members where they can use their languages for socio-economic purposes such as business, employment, healthcare, education, and social networking (Hiebert, 2014; Qadeer et al., 2010; Shuva, 2021). For instance, the Alberta Provincial Electoral Divisions report on Calgary Northeast (Government of Alberta, 2018) shows that there are 12 visible minorities in the area, among which South Asians are the biggest minority group, comprising 8,005 (36%) out of a total visible minority population of 40,300. The same report also shows that among the six major non-official languages spoken in Northeast Calgary, Punjabi is spoken by 2,145 out of 9,495 people, which makes it the second most spoken language in the area after Tagalog. These data prove the existence of South Asian ethnic concentrations and multilingualism in the area and spark curiosity about language practices within these ethnic networks and their contribution to the integration of South Asians into broader Calgary and Albertan society. Although this study has grouped Bangladeshis, Indians, and Pakistanis together to provide baseline data about their language practices for integration, it does not intend to project them as a homogenous group, nor does it undermine the lingo-cultural diversity that characterizes these populations.

Methodology

This quantitative study used survey methods to measure patterns of language use among South Asians across the four dimensions of integration. As a descriptive research study (Mertler, 2016), it was aimed at describing how the participants use English and/or ethnic languages for economic, social, political, and health purposes. Since my review of the literature pointed out a scarcity of research on South Asians and their language use for settlement and integration, especially in the context of Alberta, descriptive research that uses survey for data collection to describe behaviors, practices, and other characteristics of groups or individuals (Creswell, 2005; Fraenkel et al., 2012) was deemed appropriate to collect baseline data on the language practices of the participants. This allowed understanding how South Asians use English and/or ethnic languages for integration as they live or work in Northeast Calgary.

Instrument

A questionnaire was developed by modifying the description of the four dimensions of integration and the indicators provided on the CIMI website (CIMI, 2020) by focusing on the language used to achieve these indicators. For instance, the economic dimension includes eight indicators such as wages, employment rate, and use of non-official languages at work. The description of these indicators explains their link with economic integration. For example, *Labour Force Participation* (indicator # 3) “refers to the percentage of individuals who are active in the labour force, either employed or unemployed-but looking for work” (CIMI, 2020, p. 6). Since this indicator relates to employment status, modifying this description to highlight the role of language, survey questions 4-7 in Part 1 of the survey (see Appendix 1) asked the participants about their use of official and/or non-official languages to find/do work in Northeast Calgary. Questions in the other three categories (i.e., social, political and health) also followed this method. In developing the questionnaire, I consulted seven community members who were aware of the socio-politico-linguistic characteristics and practices of their community members in Northeast Calgary. They were asked to provide feedback on the language (clarity) and organization (order) of the questions.

Following their feedback and suggestions that required minor changes, revisions and adjustments were made to the language for clarity, duration of the survey, and numbering of the questions.

The questionnaire included 50 questions and was divided into five sections: language use for economic integration (11 questions); language use for social integration (12 questions); language use for political integration (10 questions); language use for health integration (8 questions); and demographic questions (9 questions). The first four sections used a four-point Likert scale (*strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree*) to evaluate participants' perceptions of language use across the four dimensions of integration. The last section included demographic questions related to immigration category, country of origin, gender, age, etc.

Data Collection and Analysis

Microsoft Forms was used to create and administer the survey. A web-based survey was considered because of the comparative cost, faster data collection timing, and convenience of data analysis (Creswell, 2005; Mertler, 2016). In terms of the inclusion and exclusion criteria for survey participation, there were three benchmarks. Firstly, participants should be 18+, born in Pakistan, India, or Bangladesh, and live or work in the Northeast area of Calgary. Secondly, they should speak at least one language from their country of origin other than English or French so that they can qualify as bi/multi-linguals. Thirdly, they should have arrived as permanent residents to Canada under one of the three immigrant categories: Economic Class (skilled workers and businesspeople), Family Class (closer family members of Canadian residents living in Canada), and Humanitarian and Compassionate immigrants. Although international students, refugees and visitors also qualify as immigrants, they were not included in the study because of their temporary status or being beyond the scope of the study. These criteria were included in the consent form and participants were invited to read this information before taking the survey.

Following the inclusion/exclusion criteria and invitation methods for the actual survey, the survey instrument was piloted with 49 participants to check language clarification and instrument reliability and validity. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated using SPSS 29.0 to check internal consistency across the questions, which was 0.926. Sekaran and Bougie (2003) stated that a score of 0.70 on Cronbach's alpha coefficient is considered acceptable, while above 0.8 is good. This means that items in the survey showed higher reliability and consistency. This was followed by calculating mean and standard deviation using SPSS 29.0. After finalizing results from the pilot stage and making possible revisions to the instrument, the survey link was sent to the intended participants for actual data collection through emails, social media announcements (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, WhatsApp) (Appendix 2), and personal visits to Northeast Calgary where I handed over paper copies or bar codes to interested participants. Reminders were posted every week. The survey was open for 3 weeks. In total, 526 responses were received. After deleting incomplete responses, 493 responses remained. Participants were 58% (n=285) male and 42% (n=208) females, mostly aged between 21-29 (n=239), holding bachelor's degrees (n=189), and originating from Bangladesh (n=246), India (n=110) and Pakistan (n=106). The majority were permanent residents (n=280) and came to Canada within the last 2-5 years (n=199). Data were downloaded as an Excel file and transported to SPSS 29.0 to calculate mean and standard deviation (SD) for descriptive analysis. An overview of SD (see Tables 1-4) showed that it was lesser than 1 in all cases, which meant that the data were clustered around the mean and were reliable.

Results

Table 1 provides a summary of the language used for economic integration among the subgroup of South Asians. As can be seen, the majority of the respondents are able to use English and ethnic languages for economic activities such as real estate, selling/buying products like insurance and food, and filing taxes. Further, the use of multiple languages seems to make a positive impact on their economic integration. For instance, responding to language use at work, the total percentage of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed indicates that 87.9% can use both English and ethnic languages, and this multilingualism helps them perform their work better (85.4%) and earn more money (76.4%). Similarly, multiple languages allow consumers to make better economic decisions (83.6%), find better work opportunities (82%), and rent or buy houses (82.3%). These numbers are comparatively lower in English-only work environments (71.8%), employment opportunities (70.2%), and renting/buying houses (70%). In summary, the majority of the respondents (sum of agreed and strongly agreed = 82.6%) are able to economically settle/integrate into Alberta/Canada because of using English and ethnic languages, compared with English-only integration, where the response rate was 66.5% (16.1% lower than multilingual economic integration). These results indicate that multilingual economic integration is taking place among South Asian immigrants who work or live in Northeast Calgary.

Table 1

Language Use for Economic Integration

#	Please answer the following questions based on your perceptions of using English and/or ethnic languages for economic integration.	SA	A	D	SA	M	SD
1	I am able to use both English and my ethnic languages (e.g., Bangla, Hindi, Punjabi, Tamil, Telugu, Urdu, Pashto) at my work (examples of work include real estate, sales, business, security, restaurant).	32.9%	55%	10.8%	1.4%	3.19	.676
		<i>Total = 87.9%</i>					
2	I am able to perform work related tasks better when I use both English and my ethnic languages.	31.6%	53.8%	14.2%	0.4%	3.17	.669
		<i>Total = 85.4%</i>					
3	I am able to earn more money when I use both English and my ethnic languages at my work.	24.1%	52.3%	21.9%	1.6%	2.99	.725
		<i>Total = 76.4%</i>					
4	I am able to perform economic activities (e.g., buying insurance, paying taxes, purchasing food, etc.) better when I use only English.	17.4%	54.4%	26.2%	2%	2.87	.708
		<i>Total = 71.8%</i>					
5	I am able to perform economic activities (e.g., buying insurance, paying taxes, purchasing food, etc.) better when I use both English and ethnic languages.	27.2%	56.4%	15.2%	1.2%	3.10	.682
		<i>Total = 83.6%</i>					
6	I am able to find better work/job/employment by using only English.	19.3%	50.9%	26.8%	3%	2.86	.752
		<i>Total = 70.2%</i>					
7	I am able to find better work/job/employment by using both English and ethnic languages.	27.4%	54.6%	16.4%	1.6%	3.08	.706
		<i>Total = 82%</i>					
8	I am able to rent or buy a house (e.g., searching online, speaking to landlord/realtor/bank) by using only English.	18.1%	51.9%	28.8%	1.2%	2.87	.708
		<i>Total = 70%</i>					
9	I am able to rent or buy a house (e.g., searching online, speaking to landlord/realtor/bank) by using both English and ethnic languages.	24.3%	58%	16%	1.6%	3.05	.683
		<i>Total = 82.3%</i>					
10	Overall, I am able to economically settle/integrate in Alberta/Canada when I use only English.	16.6%	49.9%	30.6%	2.8%	2.80	.741
		<i>Total = 66.5%</i>					
11	Overall, I am able to economically settle/integrate in Alberta/Canada when I use both English and ethnic languages.	28.6%	54%	16.4%	1%	3.10	.694

Note. SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree; M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation

Table 2
Language Use for Social Integration

#	Please answer the following questions based on your perceptions of using English and/or ethnic languages for social integration.	SA	A	D	SD	M	SD
1	I am able to use only English when talking to close friends (not relatives) for help, fun or other reasons.	15.3%	45.6%	36.3%	2.8%	2.72	.743
	<i>Total = 60.9%</i>						
2	I am able to use both English and ethnic languages when talking to close friends (not relatives) for help, fun or other reasons.	27.2%	56.4%	15.8%	0.6%	3.10	.667
	<i>Total = 83.6%</i>						
3	I am able to use only English when talking to local community members (not close friends) for help, fun or other reasons.	14.8%	48.5%	34.3%	2.4%	2.76	.728
	<i>Total = 63.3%</i>						
4	I am able to use both English and ethnic languages when talking to local community members (not close friends) for help, fun or other reasons.	21.1%	57.2%	20.1%	1.6%	2.98	.691
	<i>Total = 78.3%</i>						
5	I am able to feel a strong sense of belonging (e.g., feelings of acceptance, security, etc.) to my local community when I use only English.	13.4%	52.3%	30.2%	4.1%	2.75	.733
	<i>Total = 65.7%</i>						
6	I am able to feel a strong sense of belonging (e.g., feelings of acceptance, security, etc.) to my local community when I use only ethnic languages.	17%	50.9%	29.4%	2.6%	2.82	.735
	<i>Total = 67.9%</i>						
7	I am able to feel a strong sense of belonging (e.g., feelings of acceptance, security, etc.) to my local community when I use both English and ethnic languages.	24.7%	55.6%	18.7%	1%	3.04	.688
	<i>Total = 80.3%</i>						
8	I am able to feel a strong sense of belonging to Alberta/Canada when I use only English.	14.8%	48.3%	34.1%	2.8%	2.75	.736
	<i>Total = 63.1%</i>						
9	I am able to feel a strong sense of belonging to Alberta/Canada when I use only ethnic languages.	14.2%	51.7%	32%	2%	2.78	.705
	<i>Total = 65.9%</i>						
10	I am able to feel a strong sense of belonging to Alberta/Canada when I use both English and ethnic languages.	26.4%	54.8%	18.3%	0.6%	3.07	.683
	<i>Total = 81.2%</i>						
11	Overall, I am able to socially settle/integrate in Alberta/Canada because of using only English.	15.6%	54%	28.2%	2.2%	2.83	.707
	<i>Total = 69.6%</i>						
12	Overall, I am able to socially settle/integrate in Alberta/Canada because of using both English and ethnic languages.	29.4%	50.9%	17.6%	2%	3.08	.740
	<i>Total = 80.3%</i>						

Note. SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree; M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation

Data about language use for social integration are summarized in Table 2. Participants were asked to indicate the language(s) they use for social activities and the impact this may have on their social integration in Alberta/Canada. As can be seen, the majority of the respondents (i.e., the sum of agreed and strongly agreed) are able to communicate in English and ethnic languages with their friends (83.6%) and community members (78.3%), compared with English-only for friends (60.9%) and community (63.3%). Similarly, their sense of belonging to the local community is mainly happening through English and ethnic languages (80.3%), not through English-only (65.7%) or through ethnic languages only (67.9%). A similar case can also be observed about their sense of belonging to Alberta/Canada, where both English and ethnic languages are heavily used (81.2%), compared to English-only (63.1%) or ethnic languages only (65.9%). When asked about the overall social integration in Alberta/Canada, 69.6% opted for English-only, whereas 80.3% chose both English and ethnic languages, showing a difference of 10.7%. These results show that

South Asians are able to socially integrate with their friends and local community and develop a sense of belonging to their local community and Alberta/Canada through multiple languages (with English being part of it). This indicates multilingual social integration taking place among South Asians within their community.

Findings about language use for civic and democratic participation are provided in Table 3. In this section, participants were asked to indicate their ability to use English and/or ethnic language for political activities such as volunteering, joining organizations, and participating in provincial/federal politics, and the impact these languages may have on their overall political integration. As can be seen in Table 3, the majority of the participants (i.e., the sum of agreed and strongly agreed) are able to volunteer for unpaid work in both English and ethnic languages (82.6%), compared with English-only (47.3%) or only ethnic languages (50.8%). Further, 84.7% are able to join organizations of religious, political, or social nature and community or political groups by using both English and ethnic languages, whereas such activities in only English (71.2%) or only ethnic languages (72.6%) are comparatively lower. When it comes to participating in provincial or federal politics, 52.9% indicated only English use but 81.2% chose both English and ethnic languages option. Finally, when asked about overall political settlement/integration in Alberta/Canada, 83.6% indicated their ability to use both English and ethnic languages, which is 20.7% higher than English-only (62.9%) political integration. It can be summarized that both English and ethnic languages are playing a significant role in the political integration of South Asians from Bangladesh, India and Pakistan.

Table 3
Language Use for Civic and Democratic Participation

#	Please answer the following questions based on your perceptions of using English and/or ethnic languages for political integration.	SA	A	D	SD	M	SD
1	I am able to volunteer for unpaid work in only English.	11%	36.3%	47.3%	5.5%	2.53	.761
2	I am able to volunteer for unpaid work in only ethnic languages (e.g., Bangla, Hindi, Punjabi, Tamil, Telugu, Urdu, Pashto).	11.4%	39.4%	44.2%	5.1%	2.57	.758
3	I am able to volunteer for unpaid work in both English and ethnic languages.	20.1%	62.5%	17.2%	0.2%	3.02	.618
4	I am able to involve in organizations (e.g., religious, political, social) and groups (e.g., community, political) that allow me to use only English.	12.2%	59%	26.2%	2.6%	2.81	.673
5	I am able to involve in organizations (e.g., religious, political, social) and groups (e.g., community, political) that allow me to use only ethnic languages.	16.6%	56%	25.4%	2%	2.87	.697
6	I am able to involve in organizations (e.g., religious, political, social) and groups (e.g., community, political) that allow me to use both English and ethnic languages.	28.3%	56.4%	14%	1%	3.13	.672
7	I am able to learn about or participate in provincial/federal politics in only English.	9.5%	43.4%	44.8%	2.2%	2.60	.690
8	I am able to learn about or participate in provincial/federal politics in both English and ethnic languages.	19.5%	61.7%	17%	1.8%	2.99	.662
9	Overall, I am able to politically settle/integrate in Alberta/Canada because of using only English.	13.4%	49.5%	34.1%	3%	2.73	.725
10	Overall, I am able to politically settle/integrate in Alberta/Canada because of using both English and ethnic languages.	28.4%	55.2%	14.8%	1.6%	3.10	.698

Note. SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree; M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation

The last section of the study was focused on language use for health integration. As shown in Table 4, the majority of the respondents (i.e., the sum of agreed and strongly agreed) are able to have a medical service provider who speaks both English and ethnic languages (77.5%), and 85.4% of participants are able to benefit from the multilingual health care services. Similarly, 83.4% also indicated benefiting from multilingual life stress support services such as mental health or suicide prevention, compared with English-only, where the percentage was 57.2%. When asked about overall health maintenance, 85.6% (26.9% higher than English-only) indicated that they are able to maintain good health when they can use both English and ethnic languages to utilize health services. This difference is the biggest among all four dimensions being investigated in this study. These results indicate that South Asians tend to use multilingual health care services and are able to integrate better when they can use both English and ethnic languages.

Table 4
Language Use for Health Integration

#	Please answer the following questions based on your perceptions of using English and/or ethnic languages for health integration.	SA	A	D	SD	M	SD
1	I am able to have a service provider (e.g., medical doctor, pharmacist, psychologist) that speaks only English.	13.4%	45.8%				
	<i>Total = 59.2%</i>			37.5%	3.2%	2.69	.739
2	I am able to have a service provider (e.g., medical doctor, pharmacist, psychologist) that speaks both English and ethnic languages.	21.1%	56.4%				
	<i>Total = 77.5%</i>			20.3%	1.8%	2.98	.701
3	I am able to benefit from health care services (e.g., hospital facilities, emergency services, medical treatment) in a better way when they are available in only English.	10.5%	46%				
	<i>Total = 56.5%</i>			40%	3.4%	2.64	.716
4	I am able to benefit from health care services (e.g., hospital facilities, emergency services, medical treatment) in a better way when they are available in both English and ethnic languages.	29%	56.4%				
	<i>Total = 85.4%</i>			14.2%	0.4%	3.14	.655
5	I am able to benefit from life stress support (e.g., mental health support, suicide prevention support) when they are available in only English.	10.1%	47.1%				
	<i>Total = 57.2%</i>			40%	2.8%	2.65	.700
6	I am able to benefit from life stress support (e.g., mental health support, suicide prevention support) when they are available in both English and ethnic languages.	26.2%	57.2%				
	<i>Total = 83.4%</i>			15.8%	0.8%	3.09	.668
7	Overall, I am able to maintain good health in Alberta/Canada because of medical support available in only English.	10.8%	47.9%				
	<i>Total = 58.7%</i>			37.7%	3.7%	2.66	.717
8	Overall, I am able to maintain good health in Alberta/Canada because of medical support available in both English and ethnic languages.	28.8%	56.8%				
	<i>Total = 85.6%</i>			13.2%	1.2%	3.13	.672

Note. SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree; M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation

Discussion and Conclusion

This study is concerned with understanding the use of English and ethnic languages by a sub-group of South Asians in achieving the four dimensions of integration outlined by the CIMI and the role different languages play in this regard. The findings from all four sections reveal that the participants are able to use multiple languages for economic, social, political, and health purposes within their community or where they live. These findings align with earlier research on multilingual immigrants in different parts of Canada (e.g., Fong & Shen, 2011; Hynie et al., 2011; Li & Li, 2016; Qadeer et al., 2010; Vezina & Houle, 2017) and point to multilingual workplaces, social settings, political activities, and health care services in Calgary. Since South Asians are the biggest visible minority in Northeast Calgary (Government of Alberta, 2018), these findings align with their ethnic concentration in the area, the presence of social multilingualism at micro-level, and empirical evidence about the usage of South Asian languages for socio-political-economic and health purposes. Although this study investigated the language practices of South Asians from Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan and grouped them together because of shared historical, social, and linguistic characteristics (Agarwal, 2013), it did not intend to dismiss the cultural and linguistic diversity that exists within and among these three populations. Future work may look at the three groups separately or in comparison with each other to study their language practices and how they contribute to their settlement and integration in Canada. Similarly, the study investigated *when* and *where* South Asians use multiple languages for integration but did not answer *why* they tend to do so. This would require further investigation to understand the factors and motives for multilingual interactions.

Research on language and immigration (e.g., Capstick, 2021; Ferdous et al., 2018; Hynie et al., 2011) shows that access to resources and services in multiple languages impacts immigrant well-being, settlement, and integration. The findings from this study further endorse such literature by providing empirical evidence on how official (English) and non-official (immigrant) languages contribute to newcomer settlement and integration. Economically, multilingual workplaces enhance work performance, provide opportunities for better economic decision-making, and increase chances of employment (e.g., see Fong & Shen, 2011; Li & Li, 2016). Socially, multilingualism extends opportunities for broader social interactions and relations where people are able to communicate with their friends and the local community in multiple languages, create a sense of belonging to multilingual neighborhoods and geographical locations, and integrate with linguistically and culturally diverse communities (Hynie et al., 2011; Shuva, 2021). Politically, multiple languages offer higher chances of volunteering, involvement in religious, political, social, or community organizations or groups, and participation in broader civic and democratic activities as responsible citizens (e.g., Venzina & Houle, 2017). In terms of health, the findings show that multilingual populations are able to benefit from health care services when they are available in both dominant (e.g., English) and immigrant (e.g., South Asian) languages. Since lack of proficiency in English has been reported as a language barrier for immigrant populations in Canada (e.g., Ravichandiran et al., 2022), multilingual health care services provide opportunities for patients to avail services in the language of their choice or comfort to maintain better health. Since the provincial and city governments in Alberta offer many services such as health (AHS, 2023), police (Calgary Police Service, 2023), and others (The City of Calgary, 2018) in multiple languages to accommodate linguistically diverse Albertan populations, the findings of this study provide support for these initiatives by showcasing their contribution in the settlement and integration of multilingual South Asians.

Since the study collected data from South Asians who may live or work in Northeast Calgary where they have emerged as the biggest visible ethnic community (Government of Alberta, 2018), the findings of this study also highlight the role of ethnic networks that provide opportunities for multilingual settlement and integration (e.g., Hynie et al., 2011; Shuva, 2021) in the form of social capital (Fishman, 1971; Portes, 1998; Swartz, 2012). Although the participants have indicated that they are able to better integrate across the four dimensions (i.e., economic, social, political, and health) by using both English and ethnic languages, it should be noted that such opportunities are mainly available in ethnically concentrated areas, which may make such places attractive and permanent dwellings for newcomers. As research on ethnic concentrations has pointed to both advantages (e.g., linguistic, cultural, and social support; Hynie et al., 2011; Li & Li, 2016) and disadvantages (e.g., stronger co-ethnic feelings, exploitation, lower economic benefits; Agarwal, 2013; Fong & Shen, 2011), further research is needed to explore the role of multilingual ethnic networks in the settlement and integration of South Asians and other ethnicities, the type of integration such networks shape (broader integration with multicultural/multilingual ethnicities or narrowed integration focused on co-ethnic members) (e.g., Oshaghae & Cooney, 2019), and the implications this may have for the Canadian society in the long run (e.g., see Tossutti, 2007).

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my PhD supervisor Dr. Catherine Chua (University of Calgary) for her constructive feedback on the initial draft of this paper. Many thanks to the anonymous reviewers for their comments and feedback. This paper is based upon my doctoral dissertation. Many thanks to the Werklund School of Education for its financial support in the form of Werklund Doctoral Scholarship.

References

- Abdulrahim, S., & Baker, W. (2009). Differences in self-rated health by immigrant status and language preference among Arab Americans in the Detroit Metropolitan Area. *Social Science & Medicine*, 68(12), 2097–2103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.04.017>
- Agarwal, S. K. (2013). Economic disparities among South Asian immigrants in Canada. *South Asian Diaspora*, 5(1), 7–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19438192.2013.720514>
- Agarwal, S., & Kurtz, N. (2019). Ethnic spatial segmentation in immigrant destinations – Edmonton and Calgary. *International Migration & Integration*, 20(1), 199–222. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-018-0604-y>
- Alba, I. D., & Sweningson, J. M. (2006). English proficiency and physicians' recommendation of Pap smears among Hispanics. *Cancer Detection and Prevention*, 30(3), 292–296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cdp.2006.05.003>
- Alberta Health Services. (2023). Get health system information in your language. <https://www.albertahealthservices.ca/languages/languages.aspx>
- Calgary Police Service. (2023). *Police information check: Translated consent forms and ID posters*. <https://www.calgary.ca/cps/public-services/police-information-check---translated-consent-forms-and-id-poste.html>
- Canadian Index for Measuring Integration. (2020, March). *CIMI methodology overview*. Retrieved June 15, 2022, from <https://www.integrationindex.ca/>
- Capstick, T. (2021). *Language and migration*. Routledge.

- Clarke, A., & Isphording, I. E. (2016). Language barriers and immigrant health. *Health Economics*, 26(6), 765–778. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.3358>
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson.
- Cunningham, S. A., Ruben, J. D., & Narayan, K. M. V. (2008). Health of foreign-born people in the United States: A review. *Health & Place*, 14(4), 623–635. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2007.12.002>
- Elections Canada. (2006). *Report of the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada on the 39th General Election of January 23, 2006*. www.elections.ca/content.asp?section=gen&dir=rep/re2/sta_2006&document=index&lang=e&textonly=false.
- Etowa, J., Hyman, I., Dabone, C., Mbagwu, I., Gose, B., Sano, Y., Osman, M., & Mohamoud, H. (2021). Strengthening the collection and use of disaggregated data to understand and monitor the risk and burden of COVID-19 among racialized populations. *Canadian Studies in Population*, 48(2-3), 201–216. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42650-021-00050-2>
- Ferdous, M., Lee, S., Goopy, S., Yang, H., Rumana, N., Abedin, T., & Turni, T. C. (2018). Barriers to cervical cancer screening faced by immigrant women in Canada: A systematic scoping review. *BMC Women's Health*, 18(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-018-0654-5>
- Fishman, J. A. (1971). The sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in the sociology of language* (pp. 104–217). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Fong, E., & Shen, J. (2011). Explaining ethnic enclave, ethnic entrepreneurial and employment niches: A case study of Chinese in Canadian immigrant gateway cities. *Urban Studies*, 48(8), 1605–1633. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098010379278>
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- Government of Alberta. (2018). *Alberta Provincial Electoral Divisions: Calgary-North East*. https://open.alberta.ca/dataset/8260071f-b931-464f-8c73-97b872e32a31/resource/f5d5d77a-35be-4490-a367-e50d97e74dfa/download/calgary-north-east_profile.pdf
- Government of Canada. (2022). *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration*. <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/corporate/publications-manuals/annual-report-parliament-immigration-2022.html>
- Grin, F. (2003). Language planning and economics. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 4(1), 1–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200308668048>
- Guo, S., & Guo, Y. (2016). Immigration, integration and welcoming communities: Neighbourhood-based initiative to facilitate the integration of newcomers in Calgary. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 48(3), 45–67. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.2016.0025>
- Hiebert, D. (2014). 'Parallel lives' or 'super-diversity'? An exploration of ethno-cultural enclaves in Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver, in 2011. Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/corporate/reports-statistics/research/parallel-lives-super-diversity-exploration-ethno-cultural-enclaves-montreal-toronto-vancouver-2011.html>
- Hynie, M., Crooks, V. A., & Barragan, J. (2011). Immigrant and refugee social networks: Determinants and consequences of social support among women newcomers to Canada. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research*, 43(4), 26–46.

- Lebrun, L. A. (2012). Effects of length of stay and language proficiency on health care experiences among immigrants in Canada and the United States. *Social Science & Medicine*, 74(7), 1062–1072. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.11.031>
- Li, E. X., & Li, P. S. (2016). Immigrant enclave thesis reconsidered: Case of Chinese immigrants in the enclave and mainstream economy in Canada. *International Migration & Integration*, 17, 131–151. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-014-0391-z>
- Mertler, C. A. (2016). *Introduction to educational research*. SAGE Publications.
- Milroy, L. (1980). *Language and social networks*. Basil Blackwell.
- Osaghae, O-G., & Cooney, T. M. (2019). Exploring the relationship between immigrant enclave theory and translational diaspora entrepreneurial opportunity formation. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(10), 2086–2105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1560001>
- Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.1>
- Qadeer, M., Agarwal, S. K., & Lovell, A. (2010). Evolution of ethnic enclaves in the Toronto metropolitan area, 2001-2006. *International Migration & Integration*, 11, 315–339. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-010-0142-8>
- Ravichandiran, N., Mathews, M., & Ryan, B. L. (2022). Utilization of healthcare by immigrants in Canada: A cross-sectional analysis of the Canadian Community Health Survey. *BMC Primary Care*, 23(69). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-022-01682-2>
- Raza, K., & Chua, C. (2022). Linguistic outcomes of language accountability and points-based system for multilingual skilled immigrants in Canada: A critical language-in-immigration policy analysis. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2060242>
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2003). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. Wiley.
- Severo, C. G., & Görski, E. (2017). On the relation between the sociology of language and sociolinguistics: Fishman’s legacy in Brazil. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 243, 119–132. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2016-0048>
- Shuva, N. Z. (2021). Internet, social media, and settlement: A study on Bangladeshi immigrants in Canada. *The Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*, 43(3), 291–315.
- Swartz, D. (2012). *Culture and power: The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. University of Chicago Press.
- The City of Calgary. (2018). *Multilingual Communications and Engagement Policy Report to Council*. C2018-1082. <https://pub-calgary.escribemeetings.com/Meeting.aspx?Id=0c935854-8813-43b4-8a6f-ae436c341342&Agenda=Merged&lang=English#41>
- Tossutti, L. (2007). *The electoral participation of ethnocultural communities*. Published as part of working papers series on electoral participation and outreach practices. https://elections.ca/res/rec/part/paper/ethnocultural/ethnocultural_e.pdf
- United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. (2015). *Measuring change in the socio-economic conditions of migrants*. https://unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/publications/2015/ECE_CES_42.pdf
- Vahabi, M., & Lofters, A. (2016). Muslim immigrant women’s views on cervical cancer screening and HPV self-sampling in Ontario, Canada. *BMC Public Health*, 16(868), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3564-1>

Vezina, M., & Houle, R. (2017). *Settlement patterns and social integration of the population with an immigrant background in the Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver metropolitan areas*. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/89-657-x/89-657-x2016002-eng.pdf>

Notes on Contributor

Kashif Raza is a sessional instructor and PhD candidate at Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary. His research interests include language policy and planning, language and immigration, political economy, law and ethics in education, TESOL leadership, and multilingualism. He is the chief co-editor of *Handbook of Multilingual TESOL in Practice* (Springer, 2023) and *Policy Development in TESOL and Multilingualism: Past, Present and the Way Forward* (Springer, 2021).

ORCID

Kashif Raza, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5922-2052>

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Communicative Practices of Multilingual Immigrants and Their Impact on Integration: A Case Study of South Asians in Northeast Calgary

Study Context: This study is aimed at investigating perceptions about language practices of Pakistani, Indian and Bangladeshi immigrants in Calgary, Alberta, Canada. They may live or work in Northeast Calgary and use English and/or ethnic languages (Bangla, Hindi, Pashto, Punjabi, Tamil, Urdu, etc.) for the four dimensions of integration (economic, social, civic & democratic participation, and health) identified by the Canadian Index for Measuring Integration (CIMI).

Should you take this survey? You should take this survey if you are a permanent resident or citizen of Canada who immigrated to Canada/Alberta as a first generation immigrant and came under one of the three immigration categories: Economic Class (skilled workers and business people); Family Class (close family members of Canadian residents); and Humanitarian and Compassionate Immigrants (spouses, live-in caregivers, protected persons, and temporary resident permit holders).

Survey Details: There are four parts of this survey. Each part focuses on one of the four dimensions of integration: economic, social, civic & democratic participation, and health. There are 41 questions related to these dimensions followed by nine demographic questions. This survey should not take more than 40 minutes.

Researcher: Kashif Raza, Doctoral Candidate, Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary. Email: kashif.raza@ucalgary.ca

Research Results: The results of this study will be used for my doctoral dissertation. A complete dissertation will be available on the official library website of the University of Calgary. The results of the study may also be published in academic journals or presented at conferences. My supervisor, Dr. Catherine Chua, may co-author or co-present the findings of the study. This study has been approved by the University of Calgary Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board (REB22-1430). If you have any questions or concerns about the study or my conduct as a researcher, you can contact the Research Ethics Analyst, Research Services Office, the University of Calgary at (403) 220-8640, or (403) 220-6289, or by email at cfreb@ucalgary.ca.

SIGNED CONSENT

Your signature below indicates that you have read and understood the description provided above:

- I have had an opportunity to ask questions, and my questions have been answered.
- I am willing to participate in the study.

Signature

Date

Part 1: Language Use for Economic Integration

There are eleven (11) questions in this section. These questions ask about your perceptions of using English and/or ethnic languages for economic settlement/integration in Northeast Calgary. Ethnic languages can include Bangla, Hindi, Punjabi, Tamil, Telugu, Urdu, etc.

Please answer the following questions based on your perceptions of using English and/or ethnic languages in Northeast Calgary.

- | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| <p>1. I am able to use both English and my ethnic languages (e.g., Bangla, Hindi, Punjabi, Tamil, Telugu, Urdu, Pashto) at my work (examples of work include real estate, sales, business, security, restaurant).</p> <p>Strongly Agree</p> | <p>Agree</p> | <p>Disagree</p> | <p>Strongly Disagree</p> |
| <p>2. I am able to perform work related tasks better when I use both English and my ethnic languages.</p> <p>Strongly Agree</p> | <p>Agree</p> | <p>Disagree</p> | <p>Strongly Disagree</p> |
| <p>3. I am able to earn more money when I use both English and my ethnic languages at my work.</p> <p>Strongly Agree</p> | <p>Agree</p> | <p>Disagree</p> | <p>Strongly Disagree</p> |
| <p>4. I am able to perform economic activities (e.g., buying insurance, paying taxes, purchasing food, etc.) better when I use only English.</p> <p>Strongly Agree</p> | <p>Agree</p> | <p>Disagree</p> | <p>Strongly Disagree</p> |
| <p>5. I am able to perform economic activities (e.g., buying insurance, paying taxes, purchasing food, etc.) better when I use both English and ethnic languages.</p> <p>Strongly Agree</p> | <p>Agree</p> | <p>Disagree</p> | <p>Strongly Disagree</p> |
| <p>6. I am able to find better work/job/employment by using only English.</p> <p>Strongly Agree</p> | <p>Agree</p> | <p>Disagree</p> | <p>Strongly Disagree</p> |
| <p>7. I am able to find better work/job/employment by using both English and ethnic languages.</p> <p>Strongly Agree</p> | <p>Agree</p> | <p>Disagree</p> | <p>Strongly Disagree</p> |
| <p>8. I am able to rent or buy a house (e.g., searching online, speaking to landlord/realtor/bank) by using only English.</p> <p>Strongly Agree</p> | <p>Agree</p> | <p>Disagree</p> | <p>Strongly Disagree</p> |
| <p>9. I am able to rent or buy a house (e.g., searching online, speaking to landlord/realtor/bank) by using both English and ethnic languages.</p> <p>Strongly Agree</p> | <p>Agree</p> | <p>Disagree</p> | <p>Strongly Disagree</p> |
| <p>10. Overall, I am able to economically settle/integrate in Alberta/Canada when I use only English.</p> <p>Strongly Agree</p> | <p>Agree</p> | <p>Disagree</p> | <p>Strongly Disagree</p> |
| <p>11. Overall, I am able to economically settle/integrate in Alberta/Canada when I can use both English and ethnic languages.</p> <p>Strongly Agree</p> | <p>Agree</p> | <p>Disagree</p> | <p>Strongly Disagree</p> |

Please list other examples of how you use English and/or ethnic languages for economic settlement/integration in Northeast Calgary.

Part 2: Language Use for Social Integration

There are twelve (12) questions in this section. These questions ask about your perceptions of using English and/or ethnic languages for social settlement/integration in Northeast Calgary.

Please answer the following questions based on your perceptions of using English and/or ethnic languages in Northeast Calgary.

1. I am able to use only English when talking to close friends (not relatives) for help, fun or other reasons.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
2. I am able to use both English and ethnic languages (e.g., Bangla, Hindi, Punjabi, Tamil, Telugu, Urdu, Pashto) when talking to close friends (not relatives) for help, fun or other reasons.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
3. I am able to use only English when talking to local community members (not close friends) for help, fun or other reasons.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
4. I am able to use both English and ethnic languages when talking to local community members (not close friends) for help, fun or other reasons.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
5. I am able to feel a strong sense of belonging (e.g., feelings of acceptance, security, etc.) to my local community when I use only English.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
6. I am able to feel a strong sense of belonging to my local community when I use only ethnic languages (no English).
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
7. I am able to feel a strong sense of belonging to my local community when I use both English and ethnic languages.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
8. I am able to feel a strong sense of belonging to Alberta/Canada when I use only English.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
9. I am able to feel a strong sense of belonging to Alberta/Canada when I use only ethnic languages.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
10. I am able to feel a strong sense of belonging to Alberta/Canada when I use both English and ethnic languages.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
11. Overall, I am able to socially settle/integrate in Alberta/Canada because of using only English.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
12. Overall, I am able to socially settle/integrate in Alberta/Canada because of using both English and ethnic languages.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Please list other examples of how you use English and/or ethnic languages for social settlement/integration in Northeast Calgary.

Part 3: Language Use for Civic and Democratic Participation

There are ten (10) questions in this section. These questions ask about your perceptions of using English and/or ethnic languages for civic & democratic participation in Northeast Calgary. Ethnic languages can include Bangla, Hindi, Pashto, Punjabi, Sindhi, Tamil, Telugu, Urdu, etc.

Please answer the following questions based on your perceptions of using English and/or ethnic languages in Northeast Calgary.

- | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| 1. I am able to volunteer for unpaid work in only English. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 2. I am able to volunteer for unpaid work in only ethnic languages (e.g., Bangla, Hindi, Punjabi, Tamil, Telugu, Urdu, Pashto). | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 3. I am able to volunteer for unpaid work in both English and ethnic languages. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 4. I am able to involve inorganizations (e.g., religious, political, social) and groups (e.g., community, political) that allow me to use only English. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 5. I am able to involve inorganizations (e.g., religious, political, social) and groups (e.g., community, political) that allow me to use only ethnic languages. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 6. I am able to involve inorganizations (e.g., religious, political, social) and groups (e.g., community, political) that allow me to use both English and ethnic languages. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 7. I am able to learn about or participate in provincial/federal politics in only English. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 8. I am able to learn about or participate in provincial/federal politics in both English and ethnic languages. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 9. Overall, I am able to politically settle/integrate in Alberta/Canada because of using only English. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 10. Overall, I am able to politically settle/integrate in Alberta/Canada because of using both English and ethnic languages. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

Please list other examples of how you use English and/or ethnic languages for civic & democratic participation in Northeast Calgary.

Part 4: Language Use for Health Integration

There are eight (8) questions in this section. These questions ask about your perceptions of using English and/or ethnic languages for civic & democratic participation in Northeast Calgary. Ethnic languages can include Bangla, Hindi, Pashto, Punjabi, Sindhi, Tamil, Telugu, Urdu, etc.

Please answer the following questions based on your perceptions of using English and/or ethnic languages in Northeast Calgary.

1. I am able to have a medical doctor that speaks only English.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
2. I am able to have a medical doctor that speaks both English and ethnic languages.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
3. I am able to benefit from health care services in a better way when they are available in only English.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
4. I am able to benefit from health care services in a better way when they are available in both English and ethnic languages.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
5. I am able to benefit from life stress support (e.g., mental health support, suicide prevention support) when they are available in only English.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
6. I am able to benefit from life stress support (e.g., mental health support, suicide prevention support) when they are available in both English and ethnic languages.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
7. Overall, I am able to maintain good health in Alberta/Canada because of medical support available in only English.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
8. Overall, I am able to maintain good health in Alberta/Canada because of medical support available in both English and ethnic languages.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Please list other examples of how you use English and/or ethnic languages for civic & democratic participation in Northeast Calgary.

Demographic Questions

There are nine (9) questions in this section.

1. Your age range
 - a) 18 – 20
 - b) 21 – 29
 - c) 30 – 39
 - d) 40 – 49
 - e) 50 – 59

f) 60 or older

2. Your gender

- a) Female
- b) Male
- c) Other

3. Your highest level of education

- a) Less than high school degree
- b) High school degree or equivalent
- c) Some college but no degree
- d) Bachelor's degree
- e) Master's degree
- f) Doctorate (PhD) degree

4. Language(s) you can speak or understand. You can select more than one option.

Balochi	Bangla	Burmese	Chittagonian	Dhakaiya Kutti	English	Gujarati
Hindi	Marathi	Noakhailla	Pashto	Varendr	Eastern Punjabi (India)	
	Western Punjabi (Pakistan)	Sylheti		Telugu	Urdu	Other:

5. Country you originate from

- a) Bangladesh
- b) India
- c) Pakistan

6. Your immigration status

- a) Permanent Resident of Canada
- b) Canadian Citizen
- c) Other: _____

7. Immigration category under which you arrived to Canada

- a) Economic Class (skilled workers and business-people)
- b) Family Class (close family members of Canadian residents)
- c) Humanitarian and Compassionate Immigrants (spouses, protected persons, refugees, etc.)
- d) Other: _____

8. Your total length of stay in Alberta/Canada

- a) 1 - 12 months
- b) 1 - 2 years
- c) 2 - 3 years
- d) 3 - 4 years
- e) 4 - 5 years
- f) More than 5 years

Thank you for your time and participation.

APPENDIX 2

Survey Study

Invitation Email Script

Dear _____,

You are being invited to participate in a study that is aimed at investigating language practices of Pakistani, Indian and Bangladeshi immigrants who live or work in Northeast Calgary and may use English and ethnic languages (Bangla, Hindi, Pashto, Punjabi, Sindhi, Tamil, Telugu, Urdu, etc.) for integration purposes. The Canadian Index for Measuring Integration (CIMI) proposes evaluation of immigrant performance in four areas (economic, social, civic and democratic participation, and health) to understand how well they are settling and integrating in their regions/cities/provinces. Adopting these dimensions, the main objective of this study is to understand how different languages are used to achieve these four dimensions and how they contribute to immigrant integration in Calgary and Alberta.

There are four parts of this survey. Each part focuses on one of the four dimensions of integration: economic, social, civic & democratic participation, and health. Please try to answer all the questions. This survey has 41 questions and should not take more than 40 minutes of your time. You can respond to each question by choosing one of the four options. You can also add comments at the end of each part in case there is something additional you would like to say. Thank you for your support for this study and your participation in this survey.

Survey link: <https://forms.office.com/r/YzNubp2jHW>

The University of Calgary Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board has approved this study (REB22-1430). If you are interested in participating in this study, please click on this link. This link includes introduction to the study, informed consent and the survey questions.

Best regards,
Kashif Raza