

# From Ethnicity to Race in the *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 1964 to 2010

HOWARD RAMOS  
*Dalhousie University*

La *Revue canadienne de sociologie* a été un forum important pour la recherche sur l'ethnicité et la race. Grâce à une analyse des publications publiés dans la revue entre 1964 et 2010 nous constatons que l'ethnicité a reçu plus d'attention que la race, et que la majorité des publications se sert d'une approche d'économie politique et des méthodes quantitatives. Au fil du temps, nous relevons l'abandon du concept d'ethnicité et la montée de la race et nous relevons moins d'études quantitatives. Ces changements ont lieu en parallèle avec des changements politiques et démographiques au Canada et sont en réponse aux iniquités raciales.

The *Canadian Review of Sociology* has been an important venue for scholarship on ethnicity and race. Through an analysis of publications dealing with both terms in the journal, between 1964 and 2010, the paper finds that publications have focused more on ethnicity than race, using a political economy approach, and quantitative methods. Over time, significant changes have occurred, including a move away from ethnicity to race and a move away from quantitative methods. Many of these changes have occurred in conjunction with policy and demographic changes in Canada and as a response to ongoing racial inequities.

ONE OF CANADIAN sociology's main areas of concentration is ethnicity and race.<sup>1</sup> It is a topic that is prominently featured in introductory texts and series on Canadian sociology (see, e.g., Brym and Lie 2009; Fleras and Elliott 2003; Stazewich and Liodakis 2007; Tepperman, Albanese, and Curtis 2012). Ethnicity and race is also an area of central importance to

---

Howard Ramos, Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, Dalhousie University, 6135 University Avenue, PO Box 15000, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3H 4R2, Canada. E-mail: howard.ramos@dal.ca

<sup>1</sup>. A number of colleagues have offered suggestions to improve this article, including: Richard Apostle, Philippe Couton, Frances Henry, Carl James, Martha Radice, Victor Thiessen, Morton Weinfeld, Elke Winter, and Yoko Yoshida. I would like to thank each of them for their support and collegiality. I would also like to thank the editors of the journal and special issue as well as the blind reviewers for their comments. All have helped improved the paper.

the annual meetings of the Canadian Sociological Association, generating numerous sessions and papers. The field of ethnicity and race is also seen as important enough to warrant investigation in this special anniversary issue of *Canadian Review of Sociology (and Anthropology)* (CRS).<sup>2</sup>

Through an analysis of publications in the CRS and comparison to general trends in other leading journals, this paper examines why ethnicity and race have been so central to Canadian sociology. The paper also asks if and why sociological engagement with ethnicity and race has changed over the last half century. These questions are explored through an analysis of publications in the CRS between 1964 and 2010.

## THEORETICAL PROPOSITIONS

The prominence of ethnicity and race as a sociological field of study may surprise some, given post World War II efforts to discredit race as a concept. As Satzewich and Liodakis (2007:11) note, in an excellent review of literature in the area, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization played an active role in debunking the scientific merit of the concept and this led to the conclusion that “race” is a social construct. A number of prominent sociologists concurred, such as Gans (1979), van den Berghe (1981), and Gilroy (1998) to name but a few. This critique occurred at the very same time the first issues of the CRS were being published in 1964 and shaped how ethnicity and race have been analyzed in Canada over the last half century. Yet, despite efforts to contest the term decades ago, ethnicity and race are still socially relevant today and are subject of numerous Canadian sociological investigations. One might ask why this is the case and if anything has changed?

A number of possible explanations can be offered to respond to these questions: (1) Canada is very much still defined by ethnic and racial inequities; (2) government policies have institutionalized both concepts; (3) demographic shifts and immigration have made ethnicity and race more visible; and (4) the process of contesting ethnicity and race and advocating against inequities based on these social markers reify them as meaningful categories. Let me elaborate on each in turn.

Whether or not ethnicity and race are socially constructed concepts, like many countries, Canada continues to be defined by ethnic and racial inequities. This means that even if they have no scientific merit, they are still relevant markers of Canadian identity and society. In fact, the country is still profoundly shaped by both ethnicity and race, as can be seen in relations among English, French, and “other” Canadians (see Winter 2011), or the relations among settlers and indigenous peoples (see Dickason 2003;

---

<sup>2</sup> Although the *Review* was originally published under the name *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, and only changed its name recently, for simplicity in the remainder of this paper I will use its current name and acronym throughout.

Frideres and Gadacz 2012), or through the ongoing plight of African Nova Scotians (see Nelson 2008) and other racialized people (see James 2010; Reitz and Banerjee 2007), not to mention the experiences of immigrants (see Boyd and Vickers 2000). Ethnic and racial inequities still shape contemporary Canada and this might be why the terms are still widely used in public discourse and why sociologists continue to analyze them.

Another reason for why ethnicity and race are still important is that the Canadian federal government has enacted a number of significant policies to entrench both concepts. One can easily cite policy that emerged out of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in the 1960s, the adoption of the immigration points-based system in 1967, official multiculturalism in 1971, and the inclusion of ethnicity and race in the Constitution<sup>3</sup> as just a few examples. The introduction of the measurement of the “visible minority” population in the 1981 Census, moreover, and the continual capture of it as well as ethnicity in Statistics Canada data sets may also have contributed to their use both in public discourse and academic investigation. This is not to mention the introduction of policies, such as Employment Equity in 1988 that raised heated debate over racialization and equity and are still contested today. Scholars of nationalism, such as Skocpol (1979) or Brubaker (1994), would rightly argue that such institutional practices play important roles in keeping the concepts alive and the identities they invoke. As Brubaker, Loveman, and Stamatov (2004) note, policies and statistical data shape the very schema that people use to navigate their social worlds.

Ethnicity and race may also still be important to Canadian sociology because of the country’s demography. Like many settler nations, Canada has been profoundly shaped by immigration. It is important to recall that until the immigration system was revised with the introduction of the points-based system in 1967, immigration policy in Canada was set to maintain the English and European dominance of the country (Boyd and Vickers 2000). After its introduction, Canada not only became more ethnically diverse, but also more racially diverse (Basavarajappa and Ram 2008; Boyd and Vickers 2000; Reitz and Bannerjee 2007). Since the 1970s large numbers of immigrants have moved to Canada, with about 250,000 arriving annually since the 1990s. This is both the by-product of policy changes and an impetus of many of the policies on ethnicity and race cited above. If sociology is a discipline that analyses social trends, then demographics will certainly influence the kind of sociology practiced.

One last reason for the continued prominence of ethnicity and race, not to mention the changes in how they are examined, may be that the process of contesting the categories and the inequities that come with them may in fact reify the concepts (Gilroy 1998, 1999; Goldberg 1990). Take for instance the heated debate around the Human Genome project during

---

3. A number of sections, including s. 15 (Equity rights), 16–22 (Official Language rights), or 25 and 35 (Aboriginal rights) have solidified the importance of ethnicity and race.

the 1990s that added yet more scientific evidence against the biological underpinnings of ethnicity and race. In the same decade, another example can be seen in what was to become known as the “culture wars,” where both concepts remained prominent in academic analysis. The same can be said with antiracist scholars who argued for moving toward a process-oriented notion of race through the advocacy of terms like racialization instead of a static notion of race (see Dei 1996). These recent critiques have changed how sociologists use the terms theoretically and how they research what the terms signify, but at the same time they maintain the concepts as relevant. In other words, if sociologists counter problematical social categories they must still invoke them in their efforts.

In the rest of the paper, I will examine these propositions through an analysis of articles using the terms ethnicity and/or race in the *CRS* between 1964 and 2010. The primary goal of the paper is to explore how the terms are used by scholars publishing in the *CRS* and to track changes in how they have been deployed over last 50 years.

## METHODS

To examine trends in Canadian sociology of ethnicity and race in the *CRS*, a keyword search of publications was conducted on EBSCO Host's *SocIndex with Full text*, using “TX all text” and “select a field (optional)” searches, and limiting results to those from the *CRS* or comparator journals alone. Searches used two Boolean phrases, “ethnicity” and “race,” applied related words, left document type and language open, and were conducted for five different time periods: 1964 to 1970, 1971 to 1980, 1981 to 1990, 1991 to 2000, 2001 to 2010. Each search was saved as a PDF.<sup>4</sup>

By searching publications with the “TX all text” setting results yield any mention of the keywords in a publication. When using the default of “select a field (optional)” search, EBSCO SocIndex searches: “all authors, all subjects, all keywords, all title information (including source title), and all abstracts. If an abstract is not available, the first 1,500 characters of the HTML full text of the article are searched” (EBSCO 2012). This type of search offers a more conservative harvesting of publications than a search of any mention in text. The publications gleaned from these searches thus focus on ethnicity and/or race and are not merely publications using the terms in passing. For simplicity's sake, I will refer to the “TX all text” search as “Any Mention” and the “select a field (optional)” search as “Title/Abstract/Keyword.”

To analyze how sociologists use the keywords, the publications retrieved from the Title/Abstract/Keyword search were open coded for different characteristics. In total 137 publications in the *CRS* were captured by

---

<sup>4</sup> Searches were conducted on March 1, 2012; July 27, 2012; November 1, 2012; November 5, 2012; and May 5, 2013.

that keyword search, of which two articles did not use the keywords in a manner related to conventional social science usage and five were books received. These were eliminated from the data used for detailed analysis, leaving a sample of 130 articles.

Of the characteristics originally coded, five variables<sup>5</sup> are used in this paper, including: *keyword* and *decade* of publication that are self-explanatory. Also analyzed are *Subjects* covered by a publication, which were open coded based on the publication's titles and abstracts into 18 different foci. Coding reflects my interpretation of the main focus of different articles and thus some articles cover a range of different subjects that are not captured by a focus on a single subject. Although all articles can be said to analyze the theoretical construct or empirical underpinnings of ethnicity and race, the coding of subject was done in order to drill down even further from the broad search offered on publications focusing on the area to understand how the topics are engaged. *Titles* of publications were examined through ATLAS.ti software to look at the words used in titles and to iteratively code them. This was done using the "simple quantitative content analysis" tool to get a better sense of what types of subjects were engaged by authors in *CRS*. Analysis was done for the entire 1964 to 2010 period and then again within decades. The last element of analysis was the *Methods* used in a publication. These were coded based on titles, abstracts, and methodology sections (when available) of publications. Nine different methods were coded. Most contentious is the fact that articles are analyzed in concert with book reviews, comments, research notes, and "other" articles that did not fit these categories. The decision to treat these as publications in the analysis is based on an effort to offer a broad sense of how ethnicity and race have been engaged in the *CRS* and to give credit to the scholarly importance of less conventional forms of publication in journals. Book reviews in particular offer insight into broader trends in the area occurring outside of the journal and in books considered relevant to the journal's subscribers. The paper presents these data in tabular form to offer a general portrait of trends in how ethnicity and race have been engaged in the *CRS* over the last half century and to see how the propositions advanced above help shed light on them.

## ANALYSIS

An Any Mention search of publications in the journal between 1964 and 2010 shows that roughly 39 percent of all publications<sup>6</sup> in the *CRS*

---

5. Twenty-two different metrics were coded. Analysis of these can be obtained upon request from the author.

6. Unlike the rest of the analysis these figures are based on raw searches that do not distinguish among types of publications and include books received and potentially articles using the keywords in alternate ways. For this reason the sample is greater than the 130 used in other tables.

mentioned ethnicity and/or race. As Table 1 illustrates, if additional terms like ethnic, nation, Indian, or native are added the percentage is even higher. This is not to mention the many other keywords that fall within the area and not included in the table, such as immigration, citizenship, or nationalism.

Admittedly, the analysis that follows is tempered by the decision to limit the examination to the terms ethnicity and race, which are both contested terms in the academic literature. In fact, the period analyzed in this paper begins just after efforts were made to debase the scientific merit of race and the acceptance by sociologists that the term is socially constructed. Thus, the approach taken in this paper is Bourdieusian in the sense that it examines the field within which the terms are deployed, accepting all uses, even if contested. That said, a fuller analysis of all possible keywords that explicitly and implicitly engage the area would be unwieldy and would likely still miss terms considered relevant by scholars of ethnicity and race. Additionally, the decision to analyze “ethnicity” over “ethnic,” even though the latter of the two yields more publications, was made because of the similar patterns seen across the keywords and again to make the task of detailed coding of publications more manageable. These are limitations of this paper.

With these caveats noted, we see that compared to other keywords of sociology, ethnicity and race appear at a similar overall rate. As Table 1 shows, roughly 11 percent of publications in the same period mentioned “crime,” 25 percent noted “gender” and “health,” and 20 percent mentioned “inequality.” When a more conservative, Title/Abstract/Keyword search is conducted, we see that overall “ethnicity” and “race” account for about 6 percent of the publications in the *CRS* during this period. Individually the terms rival alternate keywords and those representing other areas of interest. The area of ethnicity and race is indeed a significant concentration in the *Review* and this has not diminished over time despite strong critiques of both terms as theoretical and empirical constructs. If one revisits the four propositions advanced above, each offers a plausible explanation for the continued prominence of the keywords.

When the keywords are examined over time, however, we see interesting shifts in the area as well as in Canadian sociology. Generally, the in-text mention of the terms ethnicity and ethnic far outnumbered race over the last half century of the *CRS*, especially in the 1970s and 1980s. During those decades they were mentioned in 18 to 39 percent of the journal’s publications compare to 15 and 17 percent for race. Interestingly, however, their prominence shifted over time with race being mentioned in a greater proportion of publications in the 2000s. When compared to mentions of keywords representing other areas of Canadian sociology we also see remarkable shifts in the discipline. For instance, the proportion of publications mentioning gender or health increased substantially during the period. The shifts in attention are also seen when looking at the sample

Table 1  
**CRS\* Publications by Decade, 1964 to 2010**

Years n =	Keywords "Any Mention" search										
	Ethnicity	Ethnic	Race	Nation	Indian	Native	Crime	Gender	Health	Inequality	CRS Total
	479	800	517	694	520	545	295	646	635	524	2,567
2001–2010	21%	25%	33%	36%	13%	16%	14%	54%	41%	29%	100%
1991–2000	18%	26%	22%	27%	15%	23%	11%	45%	27%	22%	100%
1981–1990	20%	30%	15%	23%	18%	20%	10%	21%	23%	24%	100%
1971–1980	18%	39%	17%	27%	31%	25%	11%	5%	16%	13%	100%
1964–1970	10%	35%	21%	28%	18%	18%	12%	1%	23%	6%	100%
Total	19%	31%	20%	27%	20%	21%	11%	25%	25%	20%	100%

  

Years n =	Keywords "Title/Abstract/Keyword" search**										
	Ethnicity	Ethnic	Race	Nation	Indian	Native	Crime	Gender	Health	Inequality	CRS Total
	85	150	67	61	114	59	53	122	85	55	2,567
2001–2010	1%	2%	3%	3%	2%	1%	1%	11%	5%	4%	100%
1991–2000	3%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	8%	4%	1%	100%
1981–1990	4%	5%	2%	1%	4%	2%	2%	4%	4%	2%	100%
1971–1980	4%	9%	3%	2%	8%	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%	100%
1964–1970	4%	8%	2%	3%	3%	2%	4%	0%	2%	1%	100%
Total	3%	6%	3%	2%	4%	2%	2%	5%	3%	2%	100%

\*\*2001–2010 searches were constructed by merging CRS and CRSa searches.

\*\*Title/Abstract/Keyword searches used the default setting of "select a field (optional)" field in EBSCO SocIndex searches: "all authors, all subjects, all keywords, all title information (including source title), and all abstracts. If an abstract is not available, the first 1,500 characters of the HTML full text of the article are searched" (EBSCO 2012).

of articles from the Title/Abstract/Keyword search. Ethnicity is again overtaken by race as time goes on. When publications mentioning ethnicity and/or race are examined in isolation from other publications, the shift is even more pronounced—ethnicity accounts for 75 percent of the sample of 130 publications and race accounts for 25 percent. By the 2000s ethnicity accounted for just 21 percent of the sample and race 64 percent. Of the propositions offered, the second and third appear to offer the most insight on the changes. This becomes apparent as publications on ethnicity and/or race are examined in more detail.

In Table 2, which reports on the primary focus or subject analyzed in publications between 1964 and 2000, we see that the top three most examined subjects for the period include stratification/class/mobility/social status, ethnic/racial boundaries/identity, and discrimination/stereotypes/racism. (Here book reviews are excluded leaving only articles, comments, research notes, and other types of publication.) The focus on stratification/class/mobility/social status is heavily influenced by the legacy of John Porter's (1965) *Vertical Mosaic*. In part this is reflected by his colleagues (e.g., Pineo 1977, 1988) and students (e.g., Clement 1981) who were instrumental in discussing ethnic mobility and social status. It is also seen in those who critically revisited his hypotheses in later periods (e.g., Ogmundson and McLaughlin 1992) and is bolstered by as a special issue of the *CRS* devoted to his work and legacy shortly after his untimely death (e.g., Clement 1981; Vallee 1981). This is not to mention those, such as Li (1978, 1979) among others, who work in the dominant Canadian political economy tradition.

Attention to ethnic/racial boundaries/identity was less concentrated around the work of a single scholar. Instead, articles on these issues focused on a wider range of issues, such as Breton et al. (1975) who offered an overview of a conference on Canadian cultures and ethnic groups, or Makabe (1979) who looked at Nisei Japanese–Canadians in Toronto, or Shiose (1995) who researched the construction of “others” and Allophone communities in Quebec. If any consensus can be found in this work it would be around the questioning of the hegemony of a single “Canadian” identity and the questioning ethnic and racial boundaries. Some of this work, moreover, looked at international cases, such as anthropologists Watson (1967) and Gulger (1975) who both looked at African cases. Also interesting is the fact that Breton et al. (1975) reported on a conference held by the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association, showing the importance of the journal to the area of ethnic and racial studies and the links that sociologists and the *CRS* had across disciplines and associations in its early years.

The third most engaged subject of analysis was discrimination/stereotypes/racism. This could very well be paired with the previous grouping; however, it differed in its approach by looking at inequalities and inequity more than the construction of ethnicity, race, or identity as a process in and of itself. Interestingly, some of the scholars publishing



Table 2

**Subject of *CRS* Publications on “Ethnicity” and/or “Race” by Decade<sup>a</sup>**

Subject	1964– 1970	1971– 1980	1981– 1990	1991– 2000	2001– 2010	Total
Assimilation/integration/ segregation	1	4	1	0	2	8
Bilingualism/culturalism	1	0	0	0	0	1
Civil society	0	1	0	0	0	1
Colonialism	0	0	0	0	1	1
Discrimination/ stereotypes/racism	0	7	3	6	1	17
Education	1	2	2	2	0	7
Ethnic/racial boundaries/ identity	1	5	6	5	1	18
Family/household	1	4	1	0	0	6
Foreign workers	0	0	0	0	1	1
Gender	0	0	1	0	1	2
Health/biology/ sociobiology	0	0	2	0	1	3
Language/culture	1	0	1	1	0	3
Nationalism	0	1	1	0	0	2
Politics/voting	1	3	2	1	0	7
Rights	0	0	1	0	0	1
Stratification/class/ mobility/social status	0	9	7	3	0	19
Urbanism	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	8	36	28	18	8	98

<sup>a</sup>Following the advice of one of the anonymous reviewers the 32 book reviews coded are excluded. The total  $n = 130$ .

on these issues also published in the political economy tradition and on issues of stratification and social mobility. However, in their later works they began to look more specifically at specific group inequalities based on visible minority status or racial belonging to a given ethnic or racial group. Li (1992, 1994) exemplifies this balancing across subject areas and foci. Another group of scholars writing on this subject focused on critical race studies, such as George Dei (1996) who with Agnes Calliste edited a special issue of the *CRS* on this topic, as well as a focus on the intersection of ethnicity, race, gender, and other social attributes as seen in Adams (1998). As Table 2 illustrates, these subjects were far from exhaustive of those covered by publications on ethnicity and/or race in the *Review*. Other publications looked at assimilation, education, family, and gender as well as many other issues pertinent to Canadian society. Few, however, seem to have explicitly engaged ethnicity or race as theoretical or empirical concepts or the debate around the Human Genome project. The closest

Table 3

**Top 10 Words Used in *CRS* Publication Titles on “Ethnicity”  
and/or “Race” 1964 to 2010**

Words	Rank	Number
CANADA	1	28
ETHNIC	2	23
ETHNICITY	3	22
CANADIAN	4	19
RACE	5	14
CLASS	6	12
ANALYSIS	7	9
NATIVE	8	7
STUDY	8	7
GENDER	9	6
IDENTITY	9	6
LABOUR	9	6
POLITICAL	9	6
SOCIAL	9	6
STATUS	9	6
CASE	10	5
ECONOMIC	10	5

publications in the *CRS* have come to this is through studies of ethnic, racial, and identity boundaries.

When we look at the change in subjects over time, in Table 2, we see in later years that discrimination/stereotypes and racism rose in prominence, as seen in the 1990s, as did attention to assimilation/integration/segregation in the 2000s. The debates over antiracism largely account for trends in the 1990s as well as a move toward cultural and decolonial sociologies focusing on meaning and antihegemonic notions of ethnicity and especially race.

When the subject of analysis is examined even further by considering the top 10 words used in the titles of publications on ethnicity and/or race in the *CRS* between 1964 and 2010, in Table 3, we see that similar patterns are observed.<sup>7</sup> Perhaps as one might expect, the most frequently used word in articles' titles is “Canada.”

This is followed by “ethnic” and “ethnicity” as well as “Canadian” and “race.” In part the prominence of these words is inflated because of the journal being based in Canada and because of the keywords used to search the articles. Still, ethnic and ethnicity together account for 45 mentions in titles compared to 14 citing race. In other words, ethnic and ethnicity are mentioned about three times more often than race in the

<sup>7</sup> Some words are excluded from the ranking in this table, including: title, and, of, in, book, review, on and to. These were excluded to offer a more meaningful ranking. The same is done for later analysis by decade.

articles sampled. Articles in the *CRS* have disproportionately focused on ethnicity over race. This in part might reflect the observation of James (1994, 2010) that Canadians and Canadian social scientists tend to focus on ethnicity at the cost of race.

Looking at the other six words ranked in the top 10 mentions in titles, one sees that many of them such as class, labour, political, status, and economic are closely associated with a political economy approach. Yet at the same time identity and gender also feature prominently on the list, reflecting some of the trends documented in my coding of articles. Also worth noting is the prominence of the word “native” on the list. The *CRS* has in fact published a large number of articles dealing with aboriginal issues captured by both keywords. For example, Trigger (1966) focused on the Iroquois, Ralston (1981) analyzed colonization and the role of religion and education in settler–Mi’kmaq relations, and Satzewich (1996) looked at patronage and recruitment of Indian Affairs staff. If additional aboriginal-specific keywords were used the number of articles engaging these issues would be even higher.

When we consider keywords over time, we find that during the 1964 to 1970 period there was little variety in words used, largely because of the small number of articles mentioning the keywords in that timeframe (therefore they are not illustrated in tabular form). The top words for that period were: Africa, analysis, Canadian, and study—all with two mentions compared to only one mention for all other words. In the next decade, more articles were published and more variation was found. Ethnic, Canadian, and Canada were the top three words mentioned. Other words that placed prominently were related to political economy and the city of Toronto. In the 1980s, the top three words mentioned were: Canada, ethnic, and ethnicity, followed by Canadian and political. Interestingly, John and Porter were tied with study for the fourth position. Again this reflects the prominence of Porter’s work and debate around the political economy tradition. During the 1990s ethnicity, Canada, Canadian, class, gender, labour, race, and world were the top three mentions. By the 2001 to 2010 period, however, the top three mentioned words in titles were race, class, and Canada. Analyses of titles again reflect a shift away from ethnicity to race. They also signal a shift away from a political economic approach.

The heavy focus on ethnicity in Canadian sociology and then its transition to race likely has much to do with state policies and demographics. It is important to recall that until the immigration system was revised with the introduction of the points-based system in 1967, Canadian immigration maintained the English and European dominance of the country. In 1961, for instance, just three years before the *CRS* was launched, Canadians of British origin made up about 44 percent of the population, those of other European origin accounted for 53 percent of it, and all other ethnic and racial groups accounted for about 3 percent of Canadians (Basavarajappa and Ram 2008). Given those statistics it is no wonder that race played a

secondary role to ethnicity. Yet, these demographics began to change significantly in the 1970s and have been compounded in the last 20 years with high levels of immigration, roughly about 250,000 immigrants arriving a year, from non-European countries since the 1990s. Canada's population now looks very different; by 2006<sup>8</sup> people of English descent (including multiple responses) made up 21 percent of the population (Statistics Canada 2006). This is less than half what was reported in 1966. More striking is the fact that 16 percent of the population were visible minorities (Statistics Canada 2006). In other words, Canada's population is increasingly racialized—so much so that many scholars, like Reitz and Banerjee (2007) warn that racial inequality in Canada is a significant issue, with potential to create racial divisions and tensions in the years to come.

The shift in the country's demography also contributed to many of the policy changes seen in the 1980s, likely accounting for some of the change in sociological focus. For instance, human rights legislation was introduced in the 1970s and amended in the 1980s. Frideres and Reeves (1989) published an analysis of its implementation in the *CRS* shortly thereafter. The Constitution entrenched equity for racial minorities in s. 15 in 1982 and Employment Equity legislation was brought into effect in 1988 that sought to prevent discrimination. Again, sociologists responded to these changes, as seen in Li (1992, 1994) who examined the impact of race and gender on earnings. The importance of racialization and inequities of racialized Canadians can also be seen in Dei's work (1996) and the articles linked to the special issue of the *CRS* devoted to antiracism. As a result, government policies and demographics likely help account for the move from ethnicity to race in Canadian sociological analysis.

When methods of research are examined, in Table 4, we find that quantitative approaches have dominated the publications on ethnicity and/or race in the journal. Many of these articles engaged in the Porterian tradition, with a political economy approach, and analyzed issues of stratification, class, mobility, and inequality. The next most prominent method was book review. Some might contend that a book review is not actually a method, however, these were coded as such because of their unique character as a genre of academic publication. The third most common method was a theoretical argument and/or literature review. Yet, these are a very distant third compared to articles using a quantitative approach. In fact, about three times as many articles used a quantitative approach compared to a theoretical or literature review. As the rest of the table illustrates, a number of other methods were also used in publications on ethnicity and/or race in the *CRS*.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup>. The 2011 National Household Survey data on "ethnic origin" have not been released at the time of publication and I thus rely on older data. Newer information should only accentuate what is presented.

<sup>9</sup>. It should be noted that combining ethnography and ethnology is somewhat contentious. As Martha Radice (2012) noted in personal correspondence, ethnographies tend to examine humankind and do

Table 4

**Method Used in CRS Publications on “Ethnicity” and/or “Race” by Decade**

Decade	Historical/ Comparative	Qualitative	Quantitative	Content or Discourse Analysis	Mixed Methods	Theoretical/ Literature Review	Ethnography/ Ethnology	Book Review	Other	Total
1964–1970	0%	0%	25%	13%	0%	25%	38%	0%	0%	100%
1971–1980	7%	4%	49%	0%	2%	7%	7%	20%	4%	100%
1981–1990	5%	8%	38%	3%	0%	16%	5%	24%	0%	100%
1991–2000	12%	12%	27%	0%	8%	8%	4%	31%	0%	100%
2001–2010	0%	14%	14%	14%	7%	7%	0%	43%	0%	100%
<i>n</i> =	8	10	47	4	4	14	9	32	2	130

When we consider changes in the methods used in publications on ethnicity and/or race in the *CRS* we see that despite an overall importance of quantitative methods the proportion of quantitative studies has dropped by more than two-thirds over time. In the 1971 to 1980 period these methods were used in 49 percent of the publications in the sample; by 2001 to 2010 they had decreased to just 14 percent of publications. In part the drop in publications using quantitative methods is tied to the increasing proportion of book reviews on ethnicity and race in the journal. In the 1970s book reviews accounted for 20 percent of the sample but by the 2000s they had increased twofold. Less strikingly, the use of qualitative methods increased over time, to the point where they rivaled studies using quantitative methods by 2001 to 2010, reflecting changes in Canadian sociology as a whole. This is a trend seen in the sociologies of other countries. Platt (2012:691), for instance, showed that despite efforts to increase the use of quantitative methods in the United Kingdom, fewer publications adopted them over time. She concludes this is linked to generational change with fewer new sociologists receiving training in quantitative methods and an increase in historical approaches and feminist critiques of quantitative method. Table 4 shows that theoretical and literature-based articles have decreased but continue to play a prominent role in the types of articles published in the area. Use of “other” methods, however, appears to have dropped.

On the methodological front the changes cannot fully be captured by the fact that Canada is still defined by ethnicity and race. That social fact should not affect the types of methods used. The second proposition, with respect to governmental policy shifts also does not fully account for a shift in methods. It is worth noting, however, that the quantitative engagement of racial inequities in the 1980s and 1990s was facilitated by decisions to enumerate “visible minority” categories in Statistics Canada data. In fact, an Any Mention search found that the first article to use the term in the *CRS* was Curtis and Lambert (1975) and it was the only one to use it in the 1970s. The same was the case in the 1980s, with again only one mention. By the 1990s, however, 22 publications used the term reflecting a shift in focus. Many of the articles mentioning it used quantitative analysis, but a number also used other methods. Thus Statistics Canada usage may have increased the overall engagement of race and rather than the methods used to analyze it. Demographic shifts also do not fully account for methodological changes, yet, one might argue that as new ethnic and racial groups arrive exploratory and qualitative methods are more suited to developing new theories and methodologies to examine their experiences. This also may shed some light on the adoption of a “critical” approach,

---

ontological translation whereas ethnologies usually focus on a specific culture, people, or folklore. The two were combined despite these differences to facilitate parsimony and because most of the articles using these methods were written by anthropologists who share disciplinary similarities despite the difference noted.

Table 5

**Keywords by Journal and Decade, 1964 to 2010**

Years <i>n</i> =	Keywords "Any Mention" search							
	<i>CRS</i> <sup>*</sup>		<i>CJS</i> <sup>**</sup>		<i>CES</i> <sup>***</sup>		<i>JIMI</i> <sup>****</sup>	
	Ethnicity	Race	Ethnicity	Race	Ethnicity	Race	Ethnicity	Race
	479	517	413	511	470	420	124	135
2001–2010	21%	33%	14%	24%	44%	39%	35%	38%
1991–2000	18%	22%	22%	25%	35%	32%		
1981–1990	20%	15%	15%	17%				
1971–1980	18%	17%	15%	8%				
1964–1970	10%	21%						
Total	19%	20%	16%	20%	39%	35%	35%	38%
<i>n</i> (1964–2010) =	2,567		2,536		1,190		352	

  

Years <i>n</i> =	Keywords "Title/Abstract/Keyword" search <sup>*****</sup>							
	<i>CRS</i> <sup>*</sup>		<i>CJS</i> <sup>**</sup>		<i>CES</i> <sup>***</sup>		<i>JIMI</i> <sup>****</sup>	
	Ethnicity	Race	Ethnicity	Race	Ethnicity	Race	Ethnicity	Race
	85	67	57	50	122	80	16	29
2001–2010	1%	3%	2%	2%	12%	8%	5%	8%
1991–2000	3%	3%	2%	2%	8%	6%		
1981–1990	4%	2%	2%	2%				
1971–1980	4%	3%	3%	1%				
1964–1970	4%	2%						
Total	3%	3%	2%	2%	10%	7%	5%	8%
<i>n</i> (1964–2010) =	2,567		2,536		1,190		352	

\*2001–2010 searches were constructed by merging *CRS* and *CRSA* searches.

\*\*The first issue of the *CJS* was published in 1975.

\*\*\*The first issue of *CES* was published in 1969 and is first documented in SocIndex in 1990.

\*\*\*\*The first issue of *JIMI* was published in 2000 and is first documented in SocIndex in 2003.

\*\*\*\*\*Title/Abstract/Keyword searches used the default setting of "select a field (optional)" field in EBSCO SocIndex searches: "all authors, all subjects, all keywords, all title information (including source title), and all abstracts. If an abstract is not available, the first 1,500 characters of the HTML full text of the article are searched" (EBSCO 2012).

which is not usually associated with quantitative methods, in recent years.

In the 2000s scholars working on issues of ethnicity and race had the opportunity to publish in a number of new journals such as *Journal of International Migration and Integration (JIMI)* that was launched by the Metropolis project that generated much research on immigration beginning in the mid-1990s. This is not to mention the prominence of the *Canadian Journal of Sociology (CJS)* that competes with the *CRS* for manuscripts directly and *Canadian Ethnic Studies (CES)* that has long been a venue for Canadian scholars of ethnicity and race. To examine how ethnicity and race are engaged by Canadian social scientists more generally and to see if the move from ethnicity to race documented above appears in other venues, Table 5 looks at the usage of the keywords with

Any Mention and Title/Abstract/Keyword searches in those journals over time.

When this is done, we find that other journals follow similar patterns. Perfect comparison, however, is impossible because the *CRS* is the oldest of all of these journals and because the SocIndex database only began to cover *CES* in 1990 and *JIMI* in 2003. With this caveat noted, one can see in Table 5 that Any Mention searches show that race appears in more publications than ethnicity in later years, save for *CES*. In the more conservative Title/Abstract/Keyword search, the shift is also seen but is less stark. That being said, it appears that in the 2000s race is engaged more frequently than in past years.

Although the deployment of the keywords is similar, it is worth noting that an increase in venues to publish appears to have taken a toll on the *CRS*. In the 2000s both the *CJS* and *CES* had more publications than the *CRS*. Because SocIndex does not capture the full decade for *JIMI* a comparison to that journal is not warranted. A more detailed analysis of publications in the journals is beyond the scope of this article, but it can be noted that like the *CRS*, book reviews make up a large share of publications in other journals as do other formats like research notes. As a whole it appears that ethnicity and race is still an important area of social scientific investigation, likely as a result of the ongoing inequities that people face based on their ethnicities and race, not to mention policy and demographic shifts that have entrenched them as social categories of Canadian society.

## CONCLUSION

Overall, publications on ethnicity and/or race in the *CRS* have focused more on ethnicity, using a political economy approach, and quantitative methods. Over time, however, significant changes have occurred, including a move from ethnicity to race and a move away from quantitative methods. In part the trends identified in the area reflect patterns in Canadian sociology more generally and trends in other journals. The analysis presented in this paper has shown that ethnicity and race remain prominent sociological issues in Canada. This is largely because sociologists respond to real world problems, which are shaped by government policies, not to mention demographics. As sociologists engage with these issues, both in terms of observation and critique, they reproduce discourses of ethnicity and race in the field of sociology. As a result, all of the propositions originally advanced are supported.

The importance of federal government policies and demographic changes, however, are particularly noteworthy in accounting for the shift from ethnicity to race in Canadian sociological analysis. The data



presented show that the transition in focus occurred in the 1980s and 1990s. At that time the decision to measure “visible minorities” in the 1981 census, the partition of the Constitution, and the incorporation of Employment Equity policies, among other policies, created both legislation to eliminate racial inequities and means to measure whether or not that was being achieved. These policies and measures emerged in response to changing immigration patterns resulting from the introduction of the point-based system in 1967 and are linked to the heavy intake of non-European immigrants in the 1980s and 1990s. This led to an increase in the number of racialized Canadians and played a central role in shifting sociological analysis from ethnicity to race.

The ability to continue to examine racial inequities at the national level with quantitative methods, however, might become increasingly difficult with the Harper government’s decision to limit the 2011 Census to just 11 questions—none of which deal with race (Statistics Canada 2012). Instead such questions have been relegated to the new *National Household Survey*, which is voluntary and remains unproven. As Linda Gerbner (2010) noted, writing on behalf of the Canadian Sociological Association on its blog and to the government in protest of the changes, this decision will affect the ability of social scientists to offer accurate portrayals of the country. The accessibility of reliable and quality survey data has in the past provided a basis for many of the articles in the *CRS* that have used quantitative methods and likely the transition in analysis from ethnicity to race. The precarious future of such government generated data may compound the growing trend of Canadian sociologists to move away from using quantitative methods to engage these issues in years to come.

The move away from these methods in the *CRS* is also linked to a shift away from John Porter’s sociology and more recently a move from the new political economy approach that followed it. Despite recent reexamination of Porter’s life and scholarship (e.g., Helmes-Hayes 2010), fewer and fewer Canadian sociologists teach his work—not to mention that of his students and those who debated his findings in the 1970s and 1980s. This has meant that younger sociologists have been less likely to come across not only Porter’s work, but that of other Canadian luminaries like Raymond Breton, Wallace Clement, or Leo Driedger who shaped the early debates of ethnicity and race in Canada. In part this shift occurred with the introduction of a wider range of perspectives including feminist, decolonial, postmodern, and critical race scholars that pushed the discipline in new directions and beyond the new political economy identified by Brym and Fox (1989). Much recent scholarship relies on historical, qualitative, and critical discourse methods that add new insights to the study of ethnicity and race and that are changing the way Canadian sociology is practiced.

Even so, as in the past, sociologists will likely continue to engage problems faced by Canada’s changing policies and demographics. The country is

still shaped by issues of ethnicity and increasingly inequities based on race and ongoing colonization. In the last decade the sociologists publishing in the journal have kept pace with those changes and the *CRS* has been a venue for a new generation of Canadian sociologists, who use new methods and offer innovative insights. For example, Wilkes, Corrigan-Brown, and Myers (2010) engaged media portrayals of indigenous protest in Canada; Clément (2011), wrote about the history and transition of civil liberties and human rights over the past century; and Lee and Brotman's (2011) analysis of the intersection between migration, refugee status, ethnicity, race, and sexual orientation all point to how the *Review* continues to engage pressing contemporary social problems. These works deal with issues in a multiplicity of ways, ranging from quantitative content analysis, to historical analysis, to qualitative methods. They also represent how the *CRS* and Canadian sociology encourage interdisciplinary work, with publications from scholars in sociology departments as well as other social sciences. These are all signs of the strength of sociology and its position as middle-range social science in Canada, not to mention the continued importance of the study of ethnicity and race.

## References

- Adams, T.L. 1998. "Gender and Women's Employment in the Male-Dominated Profession of Dentistry: 1867–1917." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 35(1):21–42.
- Basavarajappa, K.G. and B. Ram. 2008. "Historical Statistics of Canada." *Statistics Canada*. Retrieved August 16, 2012 (<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-516-x/sectiona/4147436-eng.htm>).
- Boyd, M. and M. Vickers. 2000. "100 Years of Immigration in Canada." *Canadian Social Trends*. Doc. 11-008. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Breton, R., J. Burnet, W. Isajiw and J. Lennards. 1975. "Research Issues on Canadian Cultures and Ethnic Groups: An Analysis of a Conference." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 12(1):81–94.
- Brubaker, R. 1994. "Nationhood and the National Question in the Soviet Union and Post-Soviet Eurasia: An Institutional Account." *Theory and Society* 23(1):47–78.
- Brubaker, R., M. Loveman and P. Stamatov. 2004. "Ethnicity as Cognition." *Theory and Society* 33(1):31–64.
- Brym, R.J. and B. Fox. 1989. *From Culture to Power: The Sociology of English Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Brym, R.J. and J. Lie. 2009. *Sociology: Points of the Compass*. Toronto: Nelson.
- Clément, D. 2011. "A Sociology of Human Rights: Rights through a Social Movements Lens." *Canadian Review of Sociology* 48(2):121–35.
- Clement, W. 1981. "John Porter and the Development of Sociology in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 18(5):583–94.
- Curtis, J.E. and R.D. Lambert. 1975. "Status Dissatisfaction and Out-Group Rejection: Cross Cultural Comparisons within Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 12(2):178–92.

- Dei, G.J.S. 1996. "Critical Perspectives in Antiracism: An Introduction." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 33(3):247–67.
- Dickason, O.P. 2003. *Canada's First Nations: A History of Founding Peoples from Earliest Times*. 3d ed. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- EBSCO. 2012. "Is the 'Default Fields' Option Available when Searching EBSCO Databases?" *EBSCO Support*. Retrieved November 1, 2012 ([http://support.ebsco.com/knowledge\\_base/detail.php?topic=&id=2985&page=1](http://support.ebsco.com/knowledge_base/detail.php?topic=&id=2985&page=1)).
- Fleras, A. and J.L. Elliott. 2003. *Unequal Relations: An Introduction to Race, Ethnic, and Aboriginal Dynamics in Canada*. Toronto, ON: Prentice Hall.
- Frideres, J. and W.J. Reeves. 1989. "The Ability to Implement Human Rights Legislation in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 26(2):311–32.
- Frideres, J.S. and R.R. Gadacz. 2012. *Aboriginal People in Canada*. 9th ed. Toronto: Person Education Canada.
- Gans, H.J. 1979. "Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2(1):1–20.
- Gerbner, L. 2010. "CSA Blog: Long Form Census." Retrieved August 20, 2012 (<http://www.csa-scs.ca/blog/long-from-census>).
- Gilroy, P. 1998. "Race Ends Here." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21(5):838–47.
- Gilroy, P. 1999. "Between Camps: Race and Culture in Postmodernity: An Inaugural Lecture." *Economy and Society* 28(2):183–97.
- Goldberg, T. 1990. *Anatomy of Racism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gulger, J. 1975. "Particularism in Subsaharan Africa: 'Tribalism' in Town." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 12(3):303–15.
- Helmes-Hayes, R. 2010. *Measuring the Mosaic: An Intellectual Biography of John Porter*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- James, C.E. 1994. "The Paradox of Power and Privilege: Race Gender and Occupational Position." *Canadian Women's Studies* 14(2):47–51.
- James, C.E. 2010. *Seeing Ourselves: Exploring Ethnicity, Race and Culture*. 4th ed. Toronto: Thompson.
- Lee, E.O.J. and S. Brotman. 2011. "Identity, Refugeeeness, Belonging: Experiences of Sexual Minority Refugees in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology* 48(3):241–74.
- Li, P. 1978. "The Stratification of Ethnic Immigrants: The Case of Toronto." *Canadian Review of Sociology* 15(1):31–40.
- Li, P. 1992. "Race and Gender as Bases of Class Fractions and Their Effects on Earnings." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 29(4):488–510.
- Li, P.S. 1979. "A Historical Approach to Ethnic Stratification: The Case of the Chinese in Canada, 1858–1930." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 16(3):320–32.
- Li, P.S. 1994. "A World Apart: The Multicultural World of Visible Minorities and the Art World of Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 31(4):365–91.
- Makabe, T. 1979. "Ethnic Identity Scale and Social Mobility: The Case of Nisei in Toronto." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 16(2):136–46.
- Nelson, J.J. 2008. *Africville: A Geography of Racism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ogmundson, R. and J. McLaughlin. 1992. "Trends in the Ethnic Origins of Canadian Elites: The Decline of the BRITS?" *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 29(2):227–42.

- Pineo, P.C. 1977. "The Social Stranding of Ethnic and Racial Groupings." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 14(2):147–57.
- Pineo, P.C. 1988. "Socioeconomic Status and the Concentric Zonal Structure of Canadian Cities." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 25(3):421–38.
- Platt, J. 2012. "Making Them Count: How Effective Has Official Encouragement of Quantitative Methods Been in British Sociology." *Current Sociology* 60(5):690–704.
- Porter, J. 1965. *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Radice, M. 2012. Personal correspondence, July 27.
- Ralston, H. 1981. "Religion, Public Policy, and the Education of Micmac Indians of Nova Scotia, 1605–1872." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 15(4):470–89.
- Reitz, J.G. and R. Banerjee 2007. "Racial Inequality, Social Cohesion, and Policy Issues in Canada." Pp. 489–545 in *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada*, edited by K. Banting, T.J. Courchene and F.L. Seidle. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Satzewich, V. 1996. "Patronage, Moral Regulation and the Recruitment of Indian Affairs Personnel, 1879–1900." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 33(2):213–34.
- Satzewich, V. and N. Liodakis. 2007. *'Race' and Ethnicity in Canada: A Critical Introduction*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Shiose, Y. 1995. "La construction des figures de l'autre: les communautés culturelles au Québec." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 32(1):91–110.
- Skocpol, T. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Statistics Canada. 2006. "Ethnocultural Portrait of Canada Highlight Tables, 2006 Census." Retrieved August 20, 2012 (<http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/hlt/97-562/pages/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo=PR&Code=01&Data=Count&Table=2&StartRec=1&Sort=3&Display=All&CSDFilter=5000>).
- Statistics Canada. 2012. "Definitions, Data Sources and Methods: Census 2011 – 2A." Retrieved August 20, 2012 ([http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Instr.pl?Function=assembleInstr&Item\\_Id=114633&lang=en&db=imdb&adm=8&dis=2](http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Instr.pl?Function=assembleInstr&Item_Id=114633&lang=en&db=imdb&adm=8&dis=2)).
- Tepperman, L., P. Albanese and J. Curtis. 2012. *Sociology: A Canadian Perspective*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Trigger, B.G. 1966. "Who Were the 'Laurentian Iroquois'?" *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 3(4):201–13.
- Vallee, F.G. 1981. "The Sociology of John Porter: Ethnicity as Anachronism." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 18(5):639–49.
- van den Berghe, P. 1981. *The Ethnic Phenomenon*. New York: Elsevier.
- Watson, G. 1967. "The Process of Passing for White in South Africa: A Study in Cumulative Ad Hockery." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 4(3):141–47.
- Wilkes, R., C. Corrigan-Brown and D.J. Myers. 2010. "Packaging Protest: Media Coverage of Indigenous People's Collective Action." *Canadian Review of Sociology* 47(4):327–57.
- Winter, E. 2011. *Us, Them, and Others: Pluralism and National Identity in Diverse Societies*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.